

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE are those to whom the most fascinating of all studies is Grammar. And something of the fascination of it is due to its dryness. Men have worked through the three monstrous volumes of Maetzner's *English Grammar*, sixteen hundred closely printed pages, and the immensity of their labour has not prevented them from enjoying it. Atlas bearing the world on his shoulders is a hero; if he enjoys his heroism it is because the burden is so unbearable.

But there is no heroism in the study of Grammar now. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by Professor James Hope MOULTON is as thorough as Maetzner. But it is written in a captivating English style. It scarcely matters whether we have already an interest in the Grammar of the Greek New Testament or not. It scarcely matters whether or not we have an interest in the New Testament. Taking this Grammar into our hands we perform no heroic act in reading it to the end.

This is the second volume, dealing with Accidence and Word-formation (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net). Or rather it is the first part of the second volume, and contains the Introduction, together with the sections on Sounds and Writing. It opens with a poem, a poem by the grammarian himself. Dr. MOULTON stands at the classroom door. He realizes that even for the study of Grammar imagination is

necessary and the fear of God. This is the poem:

Lord, at Thy word opens yon door, inviting  
Teacher and taught to feast this hour with  
Thee;

Opens a Book where God in human writing  
Thinks His deep thoughts, and dead tongues  
live for me.

Too dread the task, too great the duty calling,  
Too heavy far the weight is laid on me!

O if mine own thought should on Thy words  
falling

Mar the great message, and men hear not  
Thee!

Give me Thy voice to speak, Thine ear to  
listen,

Give me Thy mind to grasp Thy mystery;  
So shall my heart throb, and my glad eyes  
glisten,

Rapt with the wonders Thou dost show to  
me.

After the poem comes the Introduction. And here we have the opportunity of saying that, if rarely was an editor entrusted with a more delicate task, rarely has an editor shown himself so worthy of the trust. The Rev. Wilbert Francis HOWARD, M.A., B.D., might be called perhaps, in theatrical language, an understudy of Dr. MOULTON. But if

that word suggests slavish imitation it does not apply. Wherever it was his business to reproduce Dr. MOULTON, he has done so with unvarying accuracy. But he has not been less successful when he had to fall back upon his own scholarship, inspired by the master's mind and method.

We understand when we come to the Introduction. 'Dr. Moulton,' says Mr. HOWARD, 'at once began to write the Introduction *currente calamo*, but some interruption disturbed him in the middle of a sentence when only two-thirds of the chapter had been written. The editor must, of course, assume sole responsibility for the remainder of the Introduction, but he believes that what he has supplied is a faithful representation of Dr. Moulton's opinion on the questions under discussion. He was so fortunate as to track down a paper (written with great care only eighteen months earlier than the date of the Introduction) of which large use is made in § 14 and from which a few sentences are quoted in later sections. Some further extracts from Dr. Moulton's contribution to *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (by kind permission of Messrs. Macmillan) and many jottings from Dr. Moulton's College and University lectures made it possible to complete the chapter according to the author's design.'

The last paragraph of the Introduction deals with the Apocalypse. Were the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel written by one and the same hand? The grammarian says No, and he says it with some emphasis. 'Not only does the Apocalypse display a greater freedom in copiousness of vocabulary and elaborate phraseology; it is simply defiant of the restraints of grammar.'

Is there any way of accounting for that difference? Many ways have been tried. The most hopeful way was Hort's. Hort argued for an early date. If the Apocalypse was written thirty years before the Fourth Gospel the author would have time to improve his Greek, and might be able to write the faultless grammar found there.

But even Hort's solution is set aside. As early as the third century Dionysius of Alexandria, to whom Greek was a native tongue, declared the difference between the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to be a difference not of degree but of kind.

Scholars to-day refuse the thirty years required by Hort. But even if they could grant them, they hold that no ingenuity is sufficient to bridge 'the chasm between the unchartered liberty of Revelation and the austere simplicity of the Gospel according to St. John.'

The question remains, Why did the author of the Book of Revelation write such irregular and even ungrammatical Greek? Some answer, Because he thought in Semitic and had to translate his thoughts into Greek. But Dr. MOULTON is not satisfied with that answer. 'After all,' he says, 'the author was capable of writing a vigorous though irregular Greek with a very free pen and, as Dean Armitage Robinson has pointed out, "the Greek in which he expressed himself was more like the Greek of the Egyptian papyri and of inscriptions found in various parts of the Græco-Roman world." The very blunders in concord do not imply ignorance in the ordinary sense; "it is familiarity with a relaxed standard of speech, such as we find often enough in the professional letter-writers who indited the petitions and private correspondence of the peasants of the Fayûm." Perhaps it was but fitting that the weird melodies and daring harmonies in which the seer of Patmos gave utterance to the things which he had seen "which must shortly come to pass," should speak to us now in the haunting cadences of Jewish apocalyptic, and again in the popular idiom of the Græco-Roman world.'

The Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL, M.A., formerly minister of the City Temple, now Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster, has been for a year contributing short articles to the *Church Family Newspaper*. These articles he has now gathered into a volume,



which is published by Messrs. Williams & Norgate under the title of *Problems of Life* (7s. net).

Mr. CAMPBELL is at once an idealist and a realist. The problems he handles are everyday problems, and in the handling of them he never loses touch with life. But he lifts every problem into the light of the eternal. His realism and his idealism are inseparable. They are not acts of the mind which succeed one another or which proceed together side by side. They are not even different acts of the inseparable mental process. So utterly are they interfused that we look (but look in vain) for some word, some higher and fuller word, which shall express their inseparable oneness.

Mr. CAMPBELL is not an expositor. When he turns to Scripture for an illustration he often misunderstands and misappropriates. And he is not a theologian. The distinctions and deductions which he makes, and which with the obliquity of genius he regards as vitally important, are weak enough to make his chosen title of 'The New Theology' a theological byword. His absorbing interest in life, in the very life which we are now living, and his power of penetrating that life, every corner and cranny of it, with the realizable ideals of Christ, give him a peculiar right to be heard when he speaks in such short papers as those which this volume contains.

He has republished the papers, he tells us, exactly as they originally appeared *though in slightly different order*. Notice the last phrase. The italics are ours, not Mr. CAMPBELL'S. Mr. CAMPBELL sees nothing significant in it. Yet it is both characteristic and confusing. It shows how little he cares for systematic theology, or any other systematic thing. In the middle of the book he quotes a letter from a clergyman, beginning, 'I am greatly interested in the Life Problems you bring before the readers of the *Church Family Newspaper* week by week. The one on the Communion of Saints, line 21st, has a special attraction.' Yet the article on the Communion of Saints is not found by the

reader of the book until he has gone on to the very end of it.

In that article on the Communion of Saints Mr. CAMPBELL pleads for the practice of prayer for the dead. It is a practice, he believes, which the war has greatly encouraged. Even members of the Free Churches have begun to advocate it. 'Recently a prominent Nonconformist theologian, whose utterances are regarded as unimpeachably orthodox and authoritative by the denomination to which he belongs, has given to the world a treatise in which he boldly advocates a return to the ancient Christian custom of offering intercession, not only on behalf of those dear to us still in the flesh, but of those who have passed ahead of us into the life beyond death.'

No doubt that is significant, and we owe it to the war. But *timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes*. There are gift-horses which we *must* look in the mouth, because of the giver. Such a giver is war. It does not follow if he has been driven to it by the war that 'a prominent Nonconformist theologian' is right in advocating prayer for the dead. The editor of one of our religious newspapers wrote to a prominent Presbyterian theologian recently and asked him what was the attitude to prayer for the dead of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. His reply was that, so far as he was aware, the Presbyterian Church had never even raised the question. It is not probable that that which centuries of peace and war had not found worthy of discussion should now at last become a necessity of daily practice.

But the practice of prayer for the dead does not stand alone. To Mr. CAMPBELL it is part of the Communion of Saints. He cannot conceive the Communion of Saints as complete without it. 'The Communion of Saints is that active fellowship which exists between all the members of Christ's body, the Church, in this world and worlds beyond.' And how can that fellowship exist if the members of Christ's body do not pray for one another?



Now there is little doubt that the advocate of prayer of the living for the dead advocates also prayer of the dead for the living. And thus prayer for the dead is a necessary part of the doctrine or the practice of the Communion of Saints. Yet the reasonableness of prayer for the dead rests, not on the Communion of Saints, but on a special and peculiar theory of the state of the departed.

---

It rests on the theory that the souls of believers are after death exactly as they were before it. That theory is held by Mr. CAMPBELL and, so far as we know, by every other person who practises prayer for the dead. It is a theory which has never been held by Presbyterians. It may be, as Dr. Denney once said, that the Westminster divines uttered more than they could prove when they said that the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, but it is a belief which has in it more countenance from Scripture and more faith in God than any theory of gradual progress.

---

And it is not confined to Presbyterians. It is not confined to the Free Churches. The clergyman who writes to Mr. CAMPBELL about his article on the Communion of Saints finds this very fault with it, that it ignores the perfection of holiness reached by the believer at death. 'I quite believe,' he says, 'in fellowship with our dear departed ones, but distinguish between fellowship and prayers for them. Though there can be no doubt that we carry with us the characters we have formed here, yet I take it that those who are resting on the atonement of Christ, and are in living union with Him here, will find, when they pass within the veil, and see Him as He is, that the shadows which obscured their vision will flee away, and there will be a wonderful expansion of their trust and admiration and love for Him. The sight will be glorious. The unveiling of that glorious scene which will meet our gaze must make a marvellous impression upon us. We shall be filled to our utmost capacity with admiration, which will increase as our capacity expands.'

'Under these glorious surroundings,' says this clergyman, 'I cannot conceive of the Christian needing our poor prayers.' And then he expresses his belief that even before death, or let us say at the very moment of death, the believer may enjoy the sanctifying vision of Christ. Such an enjoyment is sometimes seen by those who are present at such a death-bed, and it becomes an unanswerable argument to them of the truth of the Westminster divines' daring definition. Let us quote again from this clergyman's letter to Mr. CAMPBELL.

---

'When my dear mother passed away I was holding her hand, and was almost entirely drawn after her; the nurses had to carry and lay me on a bed, where I remained for nearly two hours before coming to myself again, yet during that time the sight which I beheld was magnificent, and I found myself saying again and again, Oh, how beautiful! Oh, how beautiful! The light was far more brilliant than the noonday sun. I quite understood St. John saying, "They had no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."'

---

The son shared in the vision of the mother. That is the Communion of Saints. And there was no need, there was not even room, for prayer. His conclusion is that for those who depart to be with Christ 'all doubt and sinful propensity and imperfection will flee away, and we shall be lost in wonder, love, and praise.'

---

What does Mr. CAMPBELL say to it? With the engaging frankness which never forsakes him, he acknowledges the rebuke. He had thought only of prayer. He had forgotten the place of praise for the dead. But then he adds: 'All one would venture to say in modification of the view thus earnestly presented, is that after all not everyone who passes from this side of life to the other is ready for the wondrous unveiling of the glory which is the inheritance of the saints in light; no everyone is as this clergyman's mother. There



those who die believing who perhaps need to be spared the heavenly vision for a time, so strong are the attractions of earth. May we not pray for these? May we not continue to help them by our care and solicitude as we did before, "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ"?'

We said that the Westminster divines knew more of the Scriptures and the power of God. How much more is made manifest by that strange sentence, 'there are those who die believing who perhaps need to be spared the heavenly vision for a time, so strong are the attractions of earth.' Here it is the vision of Christ that counteracts the attractions of earth—'looking away unto Jesus.' How can it be otherwise there, where we shall see Him as He is?

Many changes have been made by the war in the thoughts of men to God and the things of God, but the most manifest change, and the most momentous for theology, is the acceptance of the principle of Atonement. It is widespread as well as decisive. You come upon it in the chaplains' anecdotes of the men; you discover it in the inspiration of some of the most recent poetry; you recognize it as the supreme motive and sustaining interest of many of the new essays and romances. That one may be called upon to die for another, and may deliberately die, is now a common belief, for it has been a common experience.

That is a victory for theology. It proves that theology has been and is in touch with life. Not one of its fundamental doctrines was more violently repudiated, not one was supposed to be more generally discredited, before the war began. When the war began man after man set his face to go up to his Jerusalem, the Jerusalem of agony and death, on behalf of his fellow-men. It is much

more than a victory for theology. It is a victory for God.

But it is not the final victory. Great as is the gain for the gospel that the principle of Atonement should be generally accepted, the acceptance of the principle of Atonement is not belief in the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ for the sin of the world. That doctrine involves three things, of which the fact that one may have to suffer for another is only the first. The other two are that by the suffering of Christ man is reconciled to God, and that by the same suffering God is reconciled to man.

Now while every theologian accepts the principle of Atonement, and while most theologians hold that by the death of Christ man is reconciled to God, there are not a few who deny that God is reconciled to man.

One of them is the late Dr. James DRUMMOND, once Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. Dr. DRUMMOND was a Unitarian. And it has to be said at once that it is impossible for a Unitarian to believe that by the death of Christ God is reconciled to man. For that involves the very doctrine of the Person of Christ against which Unitarianism is a standing protest. One man may die for another, one man may die for a multitude of other men, and the effect of his death may be so great and widespread as to become their repentance and reconciliation. But no mere man can undo the wrong that man has done to God. As the Psalmist says, 'None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him.'

Before his death Dr. DRUMMOND had prepared for publication a volume of essays on the theology of St. Paul. The volume has now been published. Its title is *Pauline Meditations* (Lindsey Press; 7s. 6d. net). In that volume (most interesting throughout, and most acceptable in almost every part) Dr. DRUMMOND deals with the Pauline



teaching on Reconciliation. He is quite convinced, and assumes in all his exposition that 'it is man who must be reconciled to God, and not God to man.'

---

Well, the best way to test the adequacy of this position is to see how much, according to this careful and candid theologian, is involved in the reconciliation of man to God. Two things are involved.

---

First, in order to reconcile man to God, 'Christ brought home to men with unexampled clearness the reality and beauty of a life in harmony with God.' Looking upon such a life, 'we come to see and understand God's will concerning us, to feel in our own breasts the aspirations of that sonship of which we had been unconscious, and to acknowledge that the heavenly Father is the end, as he is the source, of our being. If we have ears to hear, Christ calls us to the communion in which he himself dwells, and shows us how friendship with God is the secret of eternal peace. Thus to see and know that the will of the Holy One is absolutely good, and that a life in conformity with that will is the highest which men or angels can attain, is the first step towards reconciliation.'

---

Knowledge, then, knowledge of God as seen in the face of Jesus Christ, that is the first step towards reconciliation. But 'there is a power mightier than knowledge. Knowledge may pass away, and fade out of the memory, or its sublime visions may remain cold and impalpable while passion flings its glowing pleasures at our feet, or with tight embrace drags us whither we would not. What power will go down into the deep, and break the spell of passion, and breathe a Divine order over our desires and impulses? It is love, love to him who has first loved us, and who, when we no longer resist, gives us of his own Spirit. Christ was more than a noble example who points the way heavenward for those who choose to follow him. This indeed he was, if at least we consider

the example as residing not in the outward moulding of his life, but in the spirit which lay at its centre. But an example appeals only to our admiration, and leaves our love untouched; and if we pause in this view, we fail to give any adequate response to the Christian feeling, and deprive the gospel of its most moving power. We may admire that which transcends our capacity for imitation, and an example which is too far above us may depress rather than exalt. It is the love of Christ that constrains men. In his history he does not appear before us living in a sublime solitude, and enshrining within himself a distant and cold ideal. But he is down among the sinful and the lost, teaching them, pleading with them, suffering for them, and showing a sympathy and love so strange, so sweet, so thrilling, that hearts given over to despair beat with new hope, and feel as though the Divine life had chosen them, and gathered them up into itself. This impression, so powerful while, as a minister of love, he went about doing good, was deepened, as in every case of martyrdom, by that torturing death in which, in order to reconcile the world to God, he gave all that he could—himself. And so, when he was gone, his memory lingered as a vision of heavenly peace. It seemed as though God had besought men through him; for this wondrous graciousness and beauty, this entreating, suffering love, must have come straight from the Father in whose name he spoke. It is here that the great moral power of Christianity resides. It is a seeking of the lower by the higher. It is a coming down of the Divine holiness among sinful men, in order to win them and inspire them. It is an offering of love to the soul, wakening that answering love which glows into the consciousness of sonship, and is the sustaining power of spiritual life.'

---

We have quoted the whole paragraph. It is a good example of the beauty of Dr. DRUMMOND'S writing—writing, we must add, which is a reflexion from the beauty of his character. More than that, it is the last word on the moral value of the death of Christ. But is it enough?



It is not enough. For it is not operative enough. The knowledge of God seen in the life of Christ and the love of God shown in the death of Christ have not been found sufficient even to reconcile men to God. The history of Christianity in all its revivals and reformations speaks to us with unbroken witness and says that one thing more is needed even to move men to repentance, a movement which no one denies to be the first step to reconciliation.

---

About the same time as Dr. DRUMMOND was gathering together his lectures on the Pauline theology a clergyman of the Church of England was thinking out a book on the Atonement. The Rev. P. L. SNOWDEN, Vicar of Hepworth, near Huddersfield, had undertaken, at the beginning of the war, the first form of national service that came to hand. A band of tree-fellers were at work near York and he joined them. 'After a couple of weeks' practice the labour of cross-cutting became sufficiently easy and mechanical to allow one to work out minor problems in the subject which had first aroused my interest twenty years previously when getting up Dr. DALE'S great book on the Atonement for my Priest's examination. The dinner-hour, spent sitting in the sunshine on a carpet of pine-needles with one's back to a log or tree-trunk, afforded opportunity for putting one's working thoughts into the form of rough notes; and the unoccupied hours of long summer evenings spent in the pleasant cottage of the farm labourer, a true gentleman of the soil, with whom I lodged, enabled me to elaborate and arrange the day's notes.'

---

When the book was ready he issued it with the title of *The Atonement and Ourselves* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. 6d. net). For it was beaten out of the necessities of his own religious life and his intimate acquaintance with the lives of others.

---

Now it was altogether likely that a book with such an origin should be strong to represent the moral influence of the example of Christ. But it

is written for the very purpose of showing that the example of the life of Christ and the love of Christ in His death are inadequate to reconcile us to God, and that, even if they were adequate, the fundamental thing in the Atonement is not our reconciliation to God but God's reconciliation to us. The author goes so far as to say that even if we were reconciled to God and reclaimed, there is still something in God to be reckoned with. 'It is, therefore,' he says, 'one chief object of this book to oppose the theory that remedial motives are the only ones which can inspire true justice, and to claim for Divine Holiness that it has other duties and objects in view in addition to the reclamation of the sinner.'

---

Mr. SNOWDEN goes back to history. All the great movements of the past have been inspired by the Cross. And by the Cross he does not understand a great or the greatest example of self-sacrificing love, but an act of mediatorial redemption. 'They have all,' he says, 'been inspired by the Cross, from the time that the greatest missionary determined to know nothing among his converts but "Jesus, and Him crucified" (1 Co 2<sup>2</sup>), and revealed the source of the inspiration which gave him power in his cry: "God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Gal 4<sup>14</sup>).'

---

Again, 'this same concentration upon the Cross as the means of salvation from sin is found also in the case of St. Francis of Assisi, the great revivalist of the thirteenth century. We read how, in intense spiritual conflicts, "seized with a real horror for the disorders of his youth, he would implore mercy," until at last, after some years of struggle, at the foot of the crucifix of St. Damien, he found the peace and acceptance by God he longed for; and how, later, even his very body was marked with the stigmata of the Cross as evidence of the nature and intensity of the conviction which drove him to his labours, and made them so marvellously fruitful. The Crusades were not, it is true, altogether or even mainly spiritual undertakings,



but certainly religious feeling had a great deal to do with these vast movements, and the cross the crusaders bore on their shoulders expressed what was the most solemn and deepest motive inspiring them.'

And again, 'In the Reformation we find the same force at work in its central figure, Luther. The dominant thought in his mind was that which "is perhaps the most awful and imperious creation of Christianity—the sense of sin." "I tormented myself to death," he said, "to make my peace with God, but I was in darkness, and found it not." The light came with the realization that forgiveness could only be found through faith in the crucified Christ, and it was no chance collision, but the natural result of this deep conviction of the need and true source of salvation which drove him to kindle the flame of the Reformation by his public denunciation of Tetzel's sale of pardons.'

The instances are notorious, and they are representative. The more recent cases are in entire agreement. 'In our own land and in more recent

times the Evangelical movements were inspired by the same motive. The awful consequences of sin and the love of God manifested in the salvation provided by the Cross were the two great thoughts animating the Evangelical revivalists; while later, in the Oxford Movement, which was ostensibly more concerned with questions relating to the outward organization of the Church, the title of one of Newman's sermons, "The Cross of Christ the Measure of the World," is in itself a sufficient indication of the place which the Atonement filled in the spiritual life of its leaders, and explains their emphasis on the doctrine of penance.'

If, then, we are to take advantage of the present opportunity, if we are to recognize the hand of God in that strange providence which has given the doctrine of Atonement the very first place in the thoughts of men, we must make it clear that what Christ accomplished in His death was not merely to move men to repentance and faith in God, as the condition of their being reconciled to Him, but, in the words of the late Dr. Denney, 'to do a work as Reconciler which tells upon God as well as upon the sinful.'

## Praying for the Erring.

BY THE REV. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D., PROFESSOR OF DIDACTIC THEOLOGY  
IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

'If any one observe his brother sinning (sin not to death), he shall ask, and He will give life to him (to those sinning not to death). There is sin to death—I do not mean that he is to ask concerning that: all iniquity is sin, and there is sin not to death.'—1 Jn 5<sup>16, 17</sup>.

No reader of the First Epistle of John can fail to be deeply impressed with the interest of the Apostle in the Christian community. The prominent place taken in the Epistle by exhortations to love of the brethren is one of its most marked features. Among the duties arising out of brotherly love would naturally be included those which found the occasion of their exercise in the imperfect sanctification of the brotherhood. How should the individual Christian conduct himself in view

of the sin of which he could not fail to be aware in the conduct of his fellow-Christians?

Well, for one thing, he should pray for his erring brethren. It is this duty of prayer for the erring brother which is laid on the hearts of Christians in the two verses which are now before us. Having intimated the intimacy of the intercourse which the Christian has with God in prayer, and the prevailing power of the Christian's petitions—it is even said that whatever he asks he receives—the Apostle founds on this an exhortation to use this prayer-power in behalf of sinning brethren. His zeal is for the holiness of the Christian community. The instrument which he here employs to secure it is brotherly prayer. As the community is bound



together by mutual love, he gives increased firmness to its unity by adding the cement of mutual intercession. Every Christian is to besiege the throne of grace with petitions for the brethren who come under his observation as living lives less perfect than they ought to be.

This is presented as a matter of duty—'he shall ask.' 'If any one observe his brother sinning—he shall ask.' The 'any one,' although unlimited in form, is limited in fact: it is not any one whatever, but any Christian that is meant, as the words 'his brother' show. This duty is one which holds good within the limits of the Christian community; it is a specifically Christian duty, a community duty, a duty to the brotherhood as such, having its warrant and finding its purpose in the brotherly relation. The conditional form of the sentence does not suggest that it is unlikely that the Christian will observe sin in his brother, or even doubt whether he will or not—'if perchance such a thing should occur.' It is rather assumed that the thing is a thing that in the nature of the case does occur. The Apostle is positing a condition of affairs which exists. Christians, he intimates, will be aware of the presence of sin in the brotherhood.

It is to be noticed that the Apostle does not say, 'If any one observe his brother sin, but, If any one observe his brother sinning.' He is not speaking of a single act of sin, or even of a succession of disconnected acts of sin. He is speaking of habitual sinning, of a course of sinning. It is as if one would say, 'If you see a brother casting his life on a lower than the true Christian plane. What the Apostle has primarily in mind is a general life-manifestation which is content with a standard of conduct below the demands of Christian holiness. He is not thinking, it is true, of what we should speak of as gravely sinful lives, lives given over to all evil. Such lives would not be Christian lives at all, and those living them could have no place in the brotherhood. What he is thinking of is lives which are Christian but not as Christian as they ought to be. Therefore he adds at once a qualification. He does not say merely, 'If any one observe his brother sinning, but, 'If any one observe his brother sinning sin not to death. This is a brother. He is not of that world all of which lies in the evil one. He is born of God, and the evil one cannot lay hold of him. But his life is not all that the life of a child of God whose seed abides in him ought to be. What is the duty of

his fellow-Christian to him? Well, the duty now occupying the Apostle's thought is that he should pray for him. And the Apostle not only urges the duty, but adds a promise. 'He shall ask,' he says; and adds: 'And He,' that is, God whom he asks, 'will give life to him,—in the case of those who are not sinning to death.'

It is, no doubt, a little confusing to read that the answer to the prayer will be that God will give 'life' to the sinning brother. If his sinning is distinctly not to death, whether we take that phrase strongly as meaning that it is not such as brings to death, or weakly as meaning that it is not such as tends to death, he already has life. He has passed out of death into life, and that seed of God abides in him which—so we have been told—because it is God's seed will have the victory at last. We may perhaps suppose that by giving life there is meant rather the maintaining or perfecting than the initiating of life. He who lives below his privileges, in whom the life which he has received is languid or weak in its manifestations, is made by our prayers the recipient of fresh vital impulses, or powers, that he may live as the Christian should live. Hitherto living on a plane which can be spoken of only as sinful—though not mortally sinful—he will through our prayers receive newness of life.

The express limitation of the answer to our prayers for our sinning brethren to those who are not sinning to death so emphasizes this limitation, already inserted with reference to the prayer itself, as to bring the excluded class sharply before the mind. We are not surprised, therefore, to find the Apostle adding immediately, 'There is such a thing as sin to death.' We are impelled to inquire with some anxiety, what is meant by these phrases, 'sinning sin not to death,' 'sinning not to death,' 'sin to death,' 'sin not to death,' and what part the distinction intimated is intended to play in the Christian's actual intercessions. If what John means to say is that a Christian is to take good care, in interceding with God for his fellow-Christians, that he prays for none who are sinning to death but confines his petitions to those who are sinning not to death, we can only look upon his declarations as very extraordinary. For one thing, they would imply an exact knowledge in the possession of every Christian—for this intercessory prayer is required of every Christian—not merely of what kind or degree of sinning is to death, and



what is not, but also of what kind or degree of sinning is manifested in the life of every one of his brethren. Obviously this knowledge can only with difficulty be presupposed. And the assumption of it does not seem to underlie John's remarks. How, in that case, could he gravely inform his readers that 'There is sin to death,' and again that 'There is sin not to death'? Clearly his readers are not supposed by him to have all kinds and varieties of sin and all kinds and varieties of sinners already lying before their minds in clear-cut discrimination. It is implied in such remarks, that there are kinds and degrees of sinning, some of which are mortal and some not, although all sinning, because it is sinning, is a great evil. It is difficult to believe, however, that John expected his readers to classify these sinful manifestations in their minds in a graded series, not merely in the abstract but in the several manifestations of them in concrete instances, and to decide beforehand the exact standing of a brother, on the basis of the particular kind or degree of his sinning, before venturing to pray for him.

The question arises accordingly whether John may not define some sinning as sinning to death, and other as sinning not to death, not with a view to determining whom Christians are to pray for, but with a view to explaining the differences which occur in the answering of their prayers. When a Christian prays for a sinning brother, if his sinning is not to death the prayer will be answered and God will give him life; but if his sinning is to death the prayer will not be answered. Is not John, in a word, encouraging Christians to pray for their sinning brethren, and promising answers in all cases when the sinning is not to death? This explanation finds a ready application to the qualifying clauses in the early portion of the declaration. We have only to suppose that they are objective additions, describing what, in point of fact, is the case, and are not to be read subjectively as descriptive of what lies in the mind of those who pray: 'If any one observe his brother sinning what, in point of fact, is sin not to death, he shall ask and God will give life to him—in the case of those who are sinning, in point of fact, not to death.' The objective explanation may seem of more difficult application to the later clauses: 'There is sin to death: I do not say that he is to ask concerning that. All iniquity is sin, and there is sin not to death.' This is of course, in no case, a prohibition

of prayer for him who is sinning to death. 'I do not say that he shall' and 'I say that he shall not' are not the same thing. It may seem, however, to withdraw them who are sinning to death from the scope of the requirement that Christians should pray for their sinning brethren, and to suggest that apart from them there remains a wide field in which the principle of intercessory prayer may be exercised. Even here, however, the objective interpretation is not impossible. What the Apostle may be understood as saying is that, in requiring his readers to pray for their erring brethren, he does not forget that there are mortal sinners in the community. There are mortal sinners, of course; and no prayer can heal their hurt. But there is much sinning that is not mortal. And for fear of praying for the one unavailingly, we must not fail in the duty or miss the privilege of praying for the other. The question whether the sinning is mortal or not is for God, not for us. Let us pray for our sinful brethren: that is our plain duty. As to the answer to our prayers, leave that to God; let us only pray. In this view the phrase, 'I do not say that he is to ask concerning that,' may be taken with a certain concessive colouring—almost as if it ran 'I have not that in mind when I say he is to ask'; while the real scope of the injunction is given in the succeeding words: 'Every unrighteousness, however, is sin, and there is much sin not to death.' The conclusion of the whole matter accordingly runs, Therefore fail not to pray for the sinning brother: who knows but your prayer shall save the sick of soul, and the sins he has committed shall be forgiven him!

There remains the remarkable circumstance that the verb for asking in the clause, 'I do not say that he is to ask concerning it,' is not the same verb which is employed in the preceding context for asking. This sudden change in the verb, if we ought not to say that it is inexplicable, certainly has not as yet been satisfactorily explained. The synonymists have of course been at work on the two verbs, seeking to establish distinct shades of meaning for them. But their labours have not been very fruitful with respect at least to their employment in our present passage. It used to be said that the word which appears in the earlier portion of our passage is the more suitable for an inferior seeking a boon from a superior, while 'a certain equality or familiarity between the parties' is implied by that which now faces us. That dis-



inction brings us no help here; nor does the distinction which it is now more common to urge, that the verb used in the earlier clauses is employed rather in requests for things, our present verb in requests for persons. The sudden change in the word used is, indeed, so puzzling that it tempts to the supposition that the second verb is not employed here in the sense of praying at all, which is after all only a secondary meaning acquired by it in later Greek, but in its native sense of questioning, inquiring. The emphasis which falls on the word here lends colour to such a supposition; and the use of the two verbs in close contiguity in their divergent senses has a parallel in their similar employment in Jn 16<sup>23, 24</sup>. If such a supposition were entertained, the passage would no longer have even the surface appearance of excluding one kind of sinners from our prayers, although, of course, it would still leave the fundamental fact untouched, that there are those for whom our prayers will not avail. It would, on the contrary, expressly require us to pray for all sinners, intimating that though there is a sin to death, that is a matter about which we are not to make anxious inquiry before we pray, but, leaving it to God, we are for ourselves to pray for all our brethren whom we observe to be living sinful lives.

Precisely what John means by the phrase 'sin to death' has naturally been a matter of much discussion. It has commonly been assumed that some specific sin or some specific class of sins is intended; and that this specific sin or class of sins is declared to be intrinsically mortal. On this understanding, the discrimination of sins in the teaching of the Roman Church into venial and mortal, pardonable and unpardonable, is very natural. And perhaps on this understanding it is not unnatural to seek some mitigation of what seems the harshness of the implied declaration. This mitigation is sometimes sought by representing 'death' to mean not exactly 'death,' but, say, exclusion from the Christian society,—that being supposed to be, from the point of view of the brotherhood, a sort of death, as involving exclusion from the community's life. It is also sometimes sought by insisting upon a weak sense for the preposition 'to.' John does not say, it is said, that the sin in question necessarily brings death, but only that it 'tends to death.' It seems to be clear, however, that John supposed it possible that sinners sinning sin to death might be found within the Christian community: they ought not

to be there, it is true, but it seems clear they were—for it is of sinners within the community alone that John is here speaking. And certainly if prayer is to be offered for no sin which 'tends to death,' no sin whatever will be prayed for. All sinning 'tends to death,' and will certainly issue in death if not expiated and checked. The assumption which underlies this whole discussion, however, is unjustified. By 'sin to death,' John is not speaking of some specific sin, some terrible sin known to all his readers as the unpardonable sin, by the commission of which a man cuts himself off once for all from the grace of God and condemns himself to hopeless destruction; for which, when committed, therefore, Christians dare not even intercede with God. And surely he cannot be supposed to be encouraging his readers to mount the throne of judgment and apportion their final awards to their companions,—assigning life to some and consigning others to eternal doom. He is merely saying that of those whom we observe to be sinning in the community, some are, in point of fact, sinning to death, and others not; and that, in point of fact, our prayers will be of benefit to the one and not to the other. Who they are who are sinning to death, we do not in any case know. John does not suppose us to know. Only, in urging us to pray for our sinful brethren, and promising us in answer to our prayers, the gift of life to them, he warns us that there are some for whom our petitions will not thus avail. But he warns us of this, not that we may avoid praying for these unhappy ones, but that we may be prepared for the failure of our prayers in their case.

We are not, then, to vex our souls with the anxious inquiry, what the sin to death is. Much less are we to vex the souls of others, God's children, by setting them upon so fruitless a quest, with perhaps the agonizing result that they torment themselves with the fear that they may have unwittingly committed the sin to death. We cannot quite say, with the memory sharp within us of our Lord's warning to the Pharisees, that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit has never forgiveness, that there is no 'sin to death' in this particularizing sense. But we are warranted in asserting that apart from this terrible blasphemy there is no sin which we may dare to pronounce unpardonable. There is no sin so small, it is true, that it is in itself pardonable; but no sin can be so great that it is not pardonable in Christ. All sin means



death; but the life that is in Christ is life from death. The lesson from our passage is not that there is some particular sin, on committing which we are hopelessly doomed; and that therefore we must take good care to avoid committing this particular sin. The lesson is that all sin is deadly, and, if we would have life, we must shun all sin,—and that we should come also to our sinning brethren's help with our prayers. It is pitiable how prone we are to seek out some particular acts on which we would fain suspend the issues of life and death, neglecting the really important thing, the course of life itself. Good Master, said the rich young ruler, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? He wished to hang his destiny on one act, one great decisive act, which would settle the matter once for all. So, in their view of our passage, men tend to seek out some great decisive sin, by which the die may be cast once for all, and our whole future be irretrievably lost. What great sin may I do, they ask, that there may be surely inflicted on me eternal death? There is no intimation in John's words of the existence of any such great decisive sin, *the mortal sin* by way of eminence; any more than our Lord allowed in His response to the rich young ruler the existence of any such decisive deed of righteousness as he sought.

Our Lord just said calmly to His interlocutor, Keep the Commandments. The keeping of the

Commandments is the sole rule of life. In not keeping the Commandments, therefore, the pathway to death is blazed out for us. Our Lord did not mean that a sinner may purchase life for himself by keeping the Commandments. And we cannot mean that no one who breaks the Commandments, even though he breaks all of them, can be saved. We must not reckon on the one side or the other without Christ, His blood and righteousness. But the truth which needs to be insisted upon here is that righteousness and unrighteousness are to be measured not by some great thing that is done by us, but by the whole life-manifestation, made up of innumerable things that are done, and that the rule of judgment is in both cases alike just the Commandments. Sinning to death does not mean, then, in any case, the commission of some tremendous, perhaps mysterious sin, but just living out of conformity with and in transgression of the law of God. We are all by nature sinners to death. Whom the Lord in His mercy has raised by His grace out of this death into His own abounding life, we cannot certainly divine. But we can pray for our brethren whom we observe to be sinning. The issue of our praying God alone knows now; we must wait until the last day to see. Meanwhile we have the assurance that our prayers have a part in the favourable issue, and that we are co-workers by them in our brethren's salvation.

## Literature.

### THE SECOND PERIOD OF QUAKERISM.

THE late John Wilhelm Rowntree projected a complete History of Quakerism, and he saw some of the volumes of it published before he died. The work is making steady progress. Three volumes by Professor Rufus M. Jones are reckoned to belong to the series: (1) *Studies in Mystical Religion*; (2) *The Quakers in the American Colonies*; (3) *Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries*. The history of the Quakers in Great Britain was entrusted to Mr. William C. Braithwaite, whose first volume, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, was published in 1912. Mr. Braith-

waite has just seen the publication of his second volume. Its title is *The Second Period of Quakerism* (Macmillan; 15s. net).

Of most movements the second period is inferior to the first. It is not otherwise with Quakerism. Mr. Braithwaite's task in this volume cannot have been a pleasant one. He has to record a diminution of life and energy, even of moral influence and inspiration, with only some slight compensation in the way of outward social service. Can we trace the cause? The cause is nearly always the same—outward organization taking the place of inward inspiration. 'I have tried,' says Mr. Braithwaite, 'I have tried faithfully to record the extravagances which attended the first years of un-



restrained fervour; and to note the disintegration that threatened the movement from the negative mysticism of Perrot and the extreme individualism of the Wilkinson-Story party. But it is equally necessary to perceive the evils that followed the over-assertion of corporate authority. It rooted itself, as we already see in the epistle of 1666, in the pattern-conduct of the elders, and thus became the parent of an imposed tradition, and betrayed Friends into the fallacy of thinking that walking in the footsteps of men who walked with God was the same thing as walking with God. It provided the Society with ready-made ways of life and thought and thus weakened personal initiative and responsibility. And, in checking aberrations from the standard conduct, it limited the large guidance which had been the glory of the first Quaker adventure to guidance within a confined area of action.'

The result is expressed in the one word *formalism*.

Thomas Story describes the sterile consequences of this formalism. In 1716 he says of one English meeting: "We had a large meeting . . . but not very open, there being many young people in it, not yet arrived at a sufficient sense of Truth. And, though under a profession of it, many of them have little desire after it, but think themselves safe, having had their education in the form; [so] think all is well and want nothing. And so it is in many other places."

'In 1733 he attended a large Circular Yearly Meeting at Kendal consisting mostly of young people, and remarks that they were like the Samaritans in Ac 8<sup>16</sup>, who accepted Jesus as the Messiah but had not received the Holy Ghost. They believed in Christ and in the doctrine of His Light, grace or Holy Spirit, "yet the Spirit Himself is not fallen upon many of them, as a sensible and experimental dispensation of life and power; which is properly the Gospel, and the former is rather previous and introductory." Some years later, in 1751, Bownas summed up the situation in a candid letter of great historical significance: "The young generation of this age don't seem to come up so well as could be desired. The Church seems very barren of young ministers to what it was in our youth; nor is there but very little convincement to what was then. It seems to me—and I have been a minister fifty-four years—that I had more service, and better success in

my ministry, the first twenty years than I have since had for a long time. I do not find any fruit or good effect of what I do that way; and yet what I am concerned in seems to be very acceptable and well-received by others; but they don't to my observation have that good effect as I could desire they should. I have closely examined where the fault is, but don't find it out."

Surely this account was written yesterday, not two centuries ago, and surely it was written about all the Churches and not about the Quakers only.

Of the book all that we have to say is that it is a notable achievement, most readable, most reliable, a great and permanent addition to the history of religion in this land.

### THE CIVIL WAR.

Among the historians of the Civil War in America a leading place belongs by right of conquest to James Ford Rhodes, LL.D., D.Litt. It may be said that his new work, *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865* (Macmillan; \$2.50), is the book to be chosen out of all the histories by that great multitude of readers who want a history full enough to make an impression on the memory, but not so loaded with dates or other details as to burden and perplex the mind. It is not a condensation of Dr. Rhodes's larger work in three volumes, but is independent and original. It takes account of the latest sources of information, which are very considerable, and it is most gratifyingly accurate, even in the quotation of official documents. How few are the writers, historical or theological, who can quote accurately. How few realize that misquotation is a form of falsehood and only the more reprehensible that it is so common.

Dr. Rhodes begins his book with this sentence: 'The great factor in the destruction of slavery was the election of Abraham Lincoln as President in 1860 by the Republican party, who had declared against the extension of slavery into the territories.' Lincoln is present throughout, the one reliable personality. And Lincoln suffered for it. Turn to near the end. 'The burden of the war told perceptibly on Lincoln. His "boisterous laughter," wrote John Hay, "became less frequent year by year; the eye grew veiled by constant meditation on momentous subjects; the air of reserve and detachment from his surroundings increased. He aged with great rapidity." The change in Lincoln

is shown in two life masks, one made in 1860, the other in the spring of 1865. The face of 1860 belongs to a strong healthy man, is "full of life, of energy, of vivid aspiration. The other," continued Hay, "is so sad and peaceful in its infinite repose that St. Gaudens insisted when he first saw it that it was a death mask. The lines are set as if the living face like the copy had been in bronze; the nose is thin and lengthened by the emaciation of the cheeks; the mouth is fixed like that of an archaic statue; a look as of one on whom sorrow and care had done their worst without victory, is on all the features; the whole expression is of unspeakable sadness and all-sufficing strength."

### THE NEW DEMOCRACY.

Is this story authentic? 'On a certain day, when the trenches of the two great opposing armies were drawn close together, a little three-year-old child suddenly ran out upon No-Man's-Land. Quickly the roar of the big guns nearby was hushed and every form of fighting at that part of the line stopped as if the ammunition were all spent. In the midst of this quiet a big, sturdy soldier walked out upon the deadly zone unmolested, and carried the child back to the trench. There was applause from both sides, and then quickly the battle was renewed.'

The story is told by Professor William A. McKeever, LL.D., of the University of Kansas. It is told in a book entitled *Man and the New Democracy* (New York: Doran; \$1.50 net).

Professor McKeever tells that story in order to introduce the real theme of his book. The new democracy is to differ from the old in one supreme respect. Every man is to become a child again. Every man is to turn and become a little child that he may enter this new kingdom. It is a kingdom which has been made for man by the War. It is not exactly the Kingdom of Heaven as our Lord would have us understand it. But it is the nearest approach to that Kingdom which Professor McKeever seems to think this work-a-day world is fit for.

But how is a man to become as a little child? Chiefly by education. First, as Charles Lamb suggested, he must choose his grandparents carefully. For heredity has much to do with it. Next he must choose carefully the family into which he is to be immediately born. For environment has

much to do with it. Finally he is to choose well his instructors in all the arts of life, and especially his instructor in the art of making character. 'Back to the little child is therefore our watchword. Sit at the feet of this charming piece of eternal infantine divinity. Find out how he grows and knows and continues to define his life and enlarge his understanding through the normal indulgence of his instincts and desires.'

Once we have entered this kingdom we must abide in it. There are seven rules for abiding—(1) The beginning of psychic wisdom lies in the proper caretaking of the body. Be clean in person, modest in regard to your wearing apparel, regular and moderate in habits of diet and sleep, taking plenty of outdoor exercise. (2) Be faithful in the performance of your work, but be willing to take the consequences of leaving a part of it undone rather than to overstrain to the point of great fatigue. (3) Keep in touch with the great living world without, especially with some of its most progressive and democratic individuals. (4) Learn not to envy, always remembering that there is more than enough of the high things of the Spirit for all who are prepared to partake of them. (5) Withdraw yourself occasionally from yourself and your work. This might be accomplished through the reading of a poem or some other inspiring literary selection; through the observation of the things of nature at early morning or the starry heavens after nightfall. (6) Learn at times the meaning of non-resistance as well as of that of aggressiveness. (7) Get up at morning with a prayer upon your lips, and take as a text for the day something like Isaiah lx. 1: 'Arise, shine! for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!' Say this over in your mind until it sings itself into your whole being, and you will in time feel welling up from within a strange, unspeakable power which will tide you buoyantly over every difficulty that may threaten to beset your pathway during the day that is dawning.

### THE JEWISH RELIGION.

Dr. K. Kohler, President of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, has rewritten his book on *Jewish Religion* (Macmillan). He wrote it first in German, and it was translated into English. But he came to the conclusion that 'a thorough revision and remoulding of the book was necessary



to present it in an acceptable English garb.' He has enlarged it considerably (adding a chapter on Ethics), and brought it up to date. For even in Jewish theology there is life and progress.

Dr. Kohler belongs to the liberal wing of Jewish theologians, and in consequence is a student of Muhammadanism and still more of Christianity. It is in the presence of the Christian religion that he lives his life; it is in the atmosphere of Christian theology that he has written his book and expects it to be read. His attitude to Christianity (though he thinks that at times his language in defence of his own faith has been 'rather vigorous') is quite inoffensive. Listen to his estimate of the work of St. Paul:

'It cannot be denied that Paulinian Christianity, while growing into a world-conquering Church, achieved the dissemination of the Sinaitic doctrines as neither Judaism nor the Judæo-Christian sect could ever have done. The missionary zeal of the apostle to the heathen caused a fermentation and dissolution in the entire neo-Jewish world, which will not end until all pagan elements are eliminated. Eventually the whole of civilization will accept, through a purified Christianity, the Fatherhood of God, the only Ruler of the world, and the brotherhood of all men as His children. Then, in place of an unsound overemphasis on the principle of love, justice will be the foundation of society; in place of a pessimistic other-worldliness, the optimistic hope for a kingdom of God on earth will constitute the spiritual and ethical ideal of humanity. We must not be blind to the fact that only her alliance with Rome, her holding in one hand the sword of Esau and in the other the Scriptures of the house of Jacob, made the Church able to train the crude heathen nations for a life of duty and love, for the willing subordination to a higher power, and caused them to banish vice and cruelty from their deep hold on social and domestic life. Only the powerful Church was able to develop the ancient Jewish institutions of charity and redeeming love into magnificent systems of beneficence, which have led civilization forward toward ideals which it will take centuries to realize.

'Nor must we overlook the mission of the Church in the realm of art, a mission which Judaism could never have undertaken. The stern conception of a spiritual God who tolerated no visible representation of His being made impossible the development of plastic art among the Jews. The semi-

pagan image worship of the Christian Church, the representation of God and the saints in pictorial form, favoured ecclesiastical art, until it broadened in the Renaissance into the various arts of modern times. Similarly, the predominance of mysticism over reason, of the emotions over the intellect in the Church, gave rise to its wonderful creation of music, endowing the soul with new powers to soar aloft to undreamed-of heights of emotion, to be carried along as upon Seraph's wings to realms where human language falters and grows faint. Beyond dispute Christianity deserves great credit for having among all religions opened wide the flood gates of the soul by cultivating the emotions through works of art and the development of music, thereby enriching human life in all directions.'

That is a better testimony to the 'success' of Christianity than we have been accustomed to of late even from Christian writers.

#### THE BIBLE AS LITERATURE.

Dr. Richard Green Moulton is a persistent and powerful advocate for the study of the Bible as literature. He is himself Professor of Literary Theory and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, and he is editor of the 'Modern Reader's Bible.' The 'Modern Reader's Bible' was published originally in twenty-one little purple volumes, a joy to handle and a joy to read. It has also been published in one volume, which is no doubt more convenient for the workshop. A little book now issued by Professor Moulton, and entitled *The Bible at a Single View* (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net), is an introduction to the 'Modern Reader's Bible,' but at the same time it ought to be read for its own sake. The Bible is set forth as a sort of drama. It is called a drama in two acts, with an Interlude and an Epilogue. The first act is the Old Testament. The Interlude is the Wisdom Literature. The second act is the New Testament. The Epilogue is the Book of Revelation.

In an Appendix Dr. Moulton shows how to read the separate books of the Bible so as to get the good of them at once. This is what he says, for example, on the Book of Ecclesiastes: 'Few parts of Scripture are more fundamentally misunderstood than the Book of Ecclesiastes. This arises from the fact that almost every one reads into it the morbid pessimism of Solomon its reputed author. If a student of history makes the



objection that the book is later than Solomon's age by centuries, the ordinary reader has an answer which at first seems plausible; viz. that the book itself claims Solomon as author, in the words, "I the Preacher was king over Israel in Jerusalem." Thus a critical deadlock arises: but only because both parties to the discussion have ignored the literary form of this Book of Ecclesiastes. On analysis it is found to be a series of Five Essays, the space between the Essays filled in with proverbs and miscellaneous sayings, and the whole bound into a unity by a Prologue and Epilogue. With the correct form before us we may inquire, Does this book claim the authorship of Solomon? We turn first to the Prologue and Epilogue, as the natural place in which to find light on the question of authorship: we discover in this Prologue and Epilogue no suggestion as to Solomon or any other author. The same applies to the miscellaneous proverbs, and to four out of the five Essays. All connection with Solomon is confined to the First Essay; and this, on examination, proves to be a narration of an imaginary experiment to test different types of life; the experiment is put into the mouth of the historical personage best fitted to make it, and told in the first person. When the supposed experiment is concluded, the first person is dropped, and there is no further connection with Solomon. When the book is read in its literary form, it is clear that Solomon is not made the *author* of the book, but the *hero* of one incident narrated. The critical deadlock ceases, for there is now nothing to set against the late historic date claimed for this work; when read with unbiased mind it seems written in a very different spirit from that of Solomon.'

#### CHINA OF THE CHINESE.

We need not grudge the war the credit for all the good that has come out of it, the evil is sufficiently abundant. One of the good things is a better knowledge of the countries and peoples of the world. The Prime Minister challenged the members of the House of Commons to say how many of them had ever heard of a place called Teschen before the war began or even before the Peace Conference. He might have challenged us all about many another place. But we not only know something now, we have also an appetite to know more. And the war ought to have given a

great impetus to the sale of Messrs. Pitman's 'Countries and Peoples' Series.

It is a valuable series. The new volume entitled *China of the Chinese* (9s. net), by Mr. E. T. C. Werner, is well enough written to be called popular and well enough illustrated. But its great merit is in the author's first-hand and accurate knowledge, and that not of the geography only, but still more of the history of the country. There is even a certain originality about the book, and the originality is important enough to give it distinction.

Mr. Werner divides Chinese history into two parts—the Feudal period and the Monarchical period. Each of these lasted exactly twenty-one centuries. A more extraordinary thing is that they lasted exactly the same number of years. For Mr. Werner starts the Feudal period with the Great Yao, the first authentic ruler of China, who began to reign in 2357 B.C. The period ended in 221 B.C. Thus it lasted 2136 years. From 221 B.C. to A.D. 1915, when the Chinese Republic was consolidated, the monarchical form of government prevailed—again 2136 years. Now it has been the universal custom with the historians of China to skim all the earlier centuries and concentrate on the last one or two, even on the last few years of the last century. Mr. Werner has kept his book in proportion throughout. It is the first convenient history of China that deals adequately with the Feudal period.

The book is not primarily political. Mr. Werner has no great interest in wars and rumours of war. His chief interest is in the life of the people. It is an intricate subject; the author must have given much pains to preserve proportion and avoid inaccuracy throughout so vast a stretch of history. Yet he has found time to touch on some of the most recent incidents. Here is authoritative information about the pigtail. 'When the Manchus conquered China, they imposed upon the Chinese (in 1621) as a sign of subjection the shaving of the hair on the front part of the head and the plaiting of the long unshaved hair at the back into a queue or "pigtail," though the length and richness of the hair forming the plait rendered the latter term a misnomer in most cases. The Manchu costume is said to have been designed in imitation of the principal characteristics of the horse, the favourite animal of that people, the broad sleeves representing the hoofs, the queue the



mane, etc., and it was this derived fashion which was imposed on all who wished to escape massacre when the Chinese Ming emperors were deposed. Not only did the fashion spread all over the empire, but absence of the queue eventually became a sign of disgrace to the Chinese themselves, and on the subversion of the Manchu supremacy 268 years later, the queue had in innumerable cases to be forcibly removed by the agents of the newly-inaugurated Republic. It was both interesting and amusing at the time to watch soldiers stationed at the ends of narrow streets, armed with blunt scissors, seize passers-by who had not obeyed the order and saw off their queues amid the victims' remonstrances and struggles. Thus the once-detested badge of defeat and servitude was only relinquished with great reluctance.'

It would have been a wonder if the war had not brought British Israelism back to life, along with Spiritualism and other 'fancy religions.' But here it is. The title is *Britannia's Epiphany* (1s. 6d. net), the author is Col. G. W. Deane, C.B., and the publishers are Messrs. Banks & Son.

A book with the title of *The Relation of John Locke to English Deism* (Cambridge University Press; \$1 net) must make a somewhat limited appeal. But the author of it, Dr. S. G. Hefelbower, who is Professor of Philosophy in Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas, is better than his word. He is more popular than he promises to be. His definite purpose is to prove that Locke was neither the father of Deism, nor its son, but its brother. The way he puts it is this: 'The rational theologians, the Cambridge Platonists, Locke, and the Deists constitute the party of progress. They are all rationalistic; they protest against scholastic tradition and intolerance in the name of nature and reason; they face the same foes and use the same weapons. Locke and Deism would then appear as different manifestations of the same spirit of the age, which was seen also in all other writers of the liberal party. They are distinguishable parts of one whole. Their common elements are the characteristic marks of the age, and their points of divergence are the characteristic features of the respective systems. The resemblances between Locke and Deism are not those of parent and child, but rather those of fellow-members of the same family. They are

related, and closely related, but their relation is not causal, nor do they mark different stages of the same movement.'

But while he is proving that position he says so much about Deism (and Deism is a subject which claims our study just at this time) that the book is one of quite general interest and quite special profit.

The problem of religious education is the same essentially in America as in Great Britain, it differs only in its accidents. Consequently a volume with so restricted a title as *A Survey of Religious Education in the Local Church* (Cambridge University Press; \$1.25), although the Local Church is American, will be read with profit by the British teacher. And the more will be the profit that the very difference in circumstances gives freshness to the essentially identical problem. The author, Mr. William Clayton Bower, A.M., is Professor of Religious Education in Transylvania College and the College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.

The problem is how to teach religion to children—religion that shall not be simply another name for morality, and religion that shall not hinder the practice of morality by any inside casuistry or outside authority. That is the problem here, there, and everywhere. How does Professor Bower seek to solve it? By the use of the scientific method. It is a matter mainly of psychology, and psychology is science. First recognize that, and then proceed by these four steps—*observation*, or the gathering of the facts; *classification*, or the grouping of the facts; *generalization*, or the discovery of the laws which govern the facts; and *prediction*, or faith in the power of the facts to shape the future. Every step is important, but the first is the most important. Professor Bower gives one-half of his book to it. He offers an elaborate schedule of questions, in five-and-twenty departments, and at the end of each department he gives a long list of books in which the answers will be found. It is, in short, the statistical method, for the author is a firm believer in the value of statistics. Its danger is obvious. It lies in the possibility of eliminating that very thing for which all the statistics are gathered together. Just when the scientific method is most prominent and most powerful the religious spirit may be weakest and most worthless.

Messrs. Grant Richards have published a small

volume by the Count de Mauny entitled *The Peace of Suffering, 1914-1918* (2s. 6d. net). Small as it is, the reading of it takes some time. For every chapter is well thought out, and much of the thought is fresh. The leading idea is certainly not new, but it is an idea that needs ever new emphasis. It is that suffering is simply an instrument and may be used for good or ill.

Stopford Brooke was the author of many volumes of sermons in his lifetime, and the lover of sermon literature has them all. One volume has yet to be added to their number. The Rev. J. H. Weatherall, M.A., has edited a small volume entitled *The Spikenard, and Other Sermons* (Lindsey Press; 3s. 6d. net). The sermons have been chosen from manuscripts hitherto unpublished. They have been chosen by Mr. Weatherall himself, with the aim apparently of illustrating Stopford Brooke's most characteristic teaching. The first sermon, on the Alabaster Cruse of Ointment, seems to be intended to say plainly that its author was a Unitarian. The rest of the sermons have nothing sectarian or schismatic in them. Their note from first to last is the breadth of the love of God.

The literature of reunion is growing rapidly. The day will come when men will look upon it with wonder as we look in wonder now upon the literature dealing with the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. Meantime it is of keenest and most instructive interest. And the volume which Messrs. Macmillan have just published with the simple title of *Towards Reunion* (7s. 6d. net) is as instructive as any single volume that we have seen and of as absorbing an interest. The volume is an outcome of two conferences which were held at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1918 and 1919, between members of the Church of England and members of the Free Churches. The names of those who took part in the Conferences are given at the beginning of the book. There are sixty-five of them, and they seem to be thoroughly representative of all the Churches and of every part in them—with one lamentable exception.

The volume is not strictly confined to the subject of reunion. No doubt every writer understood that he was writing on behalf of reunion. And no doubt every essay in it has reunion at the back of it.

But the Bishop of Durham writes upon Evangelicalism and its Revival, Dr. Carnegie Simpson on Grace and Sacrament, Professor Peake on Universal Priesthood, Professor Bartlet on Corporate Authority. Yes, they are all about reunion, but reunion is a larger thing than we sometimes think it is. We sometimes think it is a mere question of ecclesiastical politics. There are writers here who believe that it is bound up with the coming of the Kingdom of Christ. They believe that reunion is the real preparation for the Parousia. First let us unite, and then let us look for His appearing.

But none of these writers, with all their enthusiasm can be called enthusiasts. They take a sober if a hopeful view of the future. It may be that this generation shall pass before any of these things are fulfilled. But they believe that reunion will come.

And every one of them determines to do all that in him lies to hasten its coming. Dr. Horton writes courageously about 'The Holy Spirit in the Churches,' the Bishop of Warrington on 'Democracy and Church Unity,' the Rev. T. Guy Rogers on 'Reunion and the War,' and Canon Burroughs urges 'Intercommunion' and tells us what he himself hopes from it.

The Rev. Richard Henry Malden, M.A., Vicar of S. Michael's, Headingley, and sometime Principal of Leeds Clergy School, has written a popular book on *The Old Testament, its Meaning and Value for To-Day* (Macmillan; 6s. net). Quite popular it is and therefore quite conservative. For there could not be a greater mistake made than to offer the religious public great lumps of Higher Criticism. Higher Criticism is good mental nourishment when taken in moderate meals. But there is nothing more uninviting or indigestible when laid on the table in heaped platefuls and alone. Mr. Malden is probably a very mild higher critic. Certainly his criticism here is inoffensive. And yet there is criticism. For we must make progress. We must go on from strength to strength, keeping ever before us that ideal which is a thorough understanding, appreciation, and apprehension of the Old Testament. It is meant to make us wise unto salvation. Mr. Malden utters a well-placed warning against the exclusive use of the Authorized Version. Why? Because its English is obsolete. You smile? Then you do not know.

Whence come wars? We know the answer of



St. James. The answer of Mr. Leo Perla is not really different, though he puts it in a different way. He says they come from mistaken ideas about national honour. And he is right. At the last Hague Conference it was agreed all round that every kind of dispute should be subject to arbitration 'except matters of honour and vital interests.' It was another way of saying 'except such disputes as have in the history of the world hitherto caused war.' Mr. Norman Angell wrote a book, or more than one, to prove that war did not pay. And he proved it. But what then? Then came the European War. For who cared whether war paid or not? Is the honour of the nation at stake, that is the question? Let the politician say that it is, and then, to use Mr. Perla's words, 'mob psychology with its geometric progression works with the swiftness of magic.' So Mr. Perla has written a book with the title *What is 'National Honor'?* (we spell the word as he does). It is published by Messrs. Macmillan (\$1.50).

What does he propose to do in this matter of national honour? He proposes to establish an International Court of Honour. Such a Court, he thinks, 'would have the effect of stripping the honor sentiment of its pettiness, its foolishness, and its morbid "touchiness."'

'One of the younger leaders of American philosophical thought recently expressed to me the conviction that "the discovery and statement of what Christianity really is, is the most important service which a man can render the world to-day."'

So says Mr. James Bishop Thomas, Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, in his book entitled *Religion—its Prophets and False Prophets* (Macmillan; 8s. net). Professor Thomas finds that there are two kinds of Christianity in the world. He calls the one kind prophetic, the other exploiting. But we think that for 'exploiting' he might use the word 'priestly.' For that is clearly what he means, and the word is more familiar. The Christianity of Christ was prophetic Christianity. The Christianity of history is priestly. In his book Professor Thomas describes both kinds of Christianity and urges us to get rid of the priestly kind of it and practise the prophetic. That is the purpose for which the book has been written.

That we are not wrong in preferring 'priestly' to 'exploiting,' Mr. Thomas allows, for he himself

uses it at the beginning of his book, and even draws an elaborate comparison between priesthood and prophetism. 'Priesthood,' he says, 'develops externally, in elaborated ceremonial, sacred vestments, a self-perpetuating hierarchy. Prophetism develops internally in a deeper knowledge of God and a growing sense of individual responsibility to Him. Priesthood seeks to control the avenues of approach to God through rites and practices which none but priests have the knowledge or skill or right to perform. It thus seeks to make itself essential to intercourse with God. Prophetism seeks to know God through the internal, personal or mystical approach and to impart the secret of that approach to all men. Priesthood seeks to make itself indispensable and permanent. Prophetism seeks to be inclusive and to make of every last man a mystical God-knower. The priest seeks to interpose himself as a permanent, autocratic mediator between God and the soul. The prophet seeks to mediate temporarily by way of interpretation in order that his mediation may be rendered permanently superfluous.'

There has been much discussion lately of the Apostles' Creed, especially of such clauses as the Descent into Hell and the Sitting on the Right Hand of God the Father Almighty. The question is whether these clauses are to be taken literally or interpreted symbolically. The difficulty of a literal acceptance is well brought out by Professor Edward S. Drown of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., in a book which he has written, entitled *The Apostles' Creed To-Day* (Macmillan; \$1). Take the clause referring to the Sitting on the Right Hand of God. 'The right hand,' says Dr. Drown, 'denotes the position of supreme dignity and honour, and this is of course its meaning in the creed. The symbolic character of the language is strikingly brought out by the modern translation of the creed into Chinese. In China the left hand is the position of honour and dignity, and the right hand is the position of subordination. It has therefore become necessary to explain that when the right hand of God is mentioned it is really the left hand that is meant! It might seem as though greater boldness in translation would have furthered the cause of accuracy, and that it might have been better to translate "on the left hand of God." But in any case the example is a striking one as to the need of new interpretations

if the old meaning is to be preserved. Bondage to the letter is sometimes denial of the truth.'

That quotation brings out Dr. Drown's own position. He is certainly not unorthodox, but he is quite convinced that the creed needs reinterpretation.

Mr. W. Melville Harris, M.A., has written two books on the Pilgrim Fathers. One is for profit, the other for pleasure. One, called *The Founders of New England* (1s. net), is a history of the movement, written in short chapters with subdivisions, and suggestions for further study. The other is a small volume of *Tales of the Makers of New England* (6d. net). Both are illustrated, and both are published at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street. Dr. Rendel Harris commends the one, and Dr. Jowett the other.

After a course of lectures in a Western College upon the Four Gospels, the president of the College thanked the lecturer, and said: 'Do you know, I never more than half believed before that those evangelists were real men! Now they will be living personalities for me.' The incident is reported by Dr. D. A. Hayes, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute, in a volume of introduction to *The Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts* (Methodist Book Concern; \$2 net). And it gives him his excuse for adding one more volume to the numerous volumes of introduction to the Gospels already in existence.

His purpose, then, is to introduce to us not only the Gospels themselves, but the men who wrote them. Who these men were we are not always quite sure. Professor Hayes has no hesitation in saying that they were Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. And so he has made 'a new presentation and arrangement of the existing material,' and has given it 'added interest and life by joining with it a study of the personalities of the writers involved and of the influence of their personalities upon their books.' Professor Hayes has found his method acceptable. This is the third volume of the kind that he has published, the first being *Paul and his Epistles*, and the second *John and his Writings*. Behind every book of the New Testament he finds living men whose personal experience and individual character are manifest in and through his written words, and whether Pope was

right or wrong in saying that the proper study of mankind is man there is no doubt whatever that it is the most popular study.

It must not, however, be supposed that this substantial volume is wholly biographical. There is, after all, much more about the Gospels than about the Evangelists, and the author is within his rights when he claims that he has presented the materials of the Gospels in a new way. It is at any rate his own and has all the forcefulness of sincerity. For one thing he offers an elaborate list of characteristics in the case of each of the Gospels. Take St. Matthew: (1) it is the Gospel for the Jews, (2) it is the Gospel of Fulfilment, (3) it is the Gospel of Righteousness, (4) it is the Gospel of the Kingdom, (5) it is especially the Gospel of the King, (6) it is the Gospel of Gloom, (7) it is the official Gospel, (8) it is the Gospel of Hope for the Gentiles, (9) it is the Gospel of the Church, (10) it is the Gospel of the Publican, (11) it is the Gospel of Systematic Arrangement, (12) it is the Gospel of the Threes and Sevens, (13) it is the Gospel of Dreams, (14) it is the Gospel of the Five Great Discourses, and (15) it is the Gospel of the Four Great Mountains.

Dr. Charles W. Dabney, President of the University of Cincinnati, has published, under the title of *Fighting for a New World*, five addresses which he delivered to students and others during the War (Abingdon Press; 75 cents net). The second address is on 'True Preparedness.' It is a great address, timely, incisive, memorable. How much in all enterprises rests on preparation, how much depends on the right kind of it! President Dabney is not afraid to quote Scripture and apply it. 'We read,' he says, 'that "All the work of Solomon was prepared unto the day of the foundation of the house of the Lord and until it was finished. So the house of the Lord was perfected." And the prophet declared: "And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." So in due course of time John the



Baptist came "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord," and Jesus taught that His heaven was to be a prepared place for prepared men. "Come, ye blessed of my Father," He said, "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

*Higher Flights for Airmen* (Scott; 1s. 6d. net) is the title of a short volume of spiritual counsel written by the Rev. W. T. Money, M.A., and introduced by Lieut.-General Hon. Sir H. A. Lawrence, K.C.B. The topics are Confirmation, Prayer, and the Holy Communion. There are three attractive illustrations.

The Ely Lectures delivered in 1918 at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, by Professor George Herbert Palmer have now been published under the title of *Altruism: Its Nature and Varieties* (Scribner; \$1.25 net).

Altruism is a subject which is always with us, but hitherto in a somewhat indistinct and unimpressive shape. The war has sharpened its outlines and given it reality; and in sharpening its outlines and giving it reality has made it either a burden or a delight. It is a burden upon the conscience when we feel that we are not doing for others so much as we are doing for ourselves, a delight when we discover that we can do more.

But how? Not simply by good manners. Professor Palmer discusses good manners in his second chapter and dismisses it. And not simply by giving gifts to others. The discussion of Giving takes two chapters and it is found defective and dismissed. Altruism in deed and in truth is enjoyed by means of mutuality. 'By mutuality I mean the recognition of another and myself as inseparable elements of one another, each being essential to the welfare of each. This duality of giving has always been recognized as ennobling. Even Jesus did not seek simply to give, but to induce in those to whom he gave a similar disposition. Rightly is it counted higher than simple giving, including, as it does, all which that contains and more.' But Dr. Palmer has not gone far before he has to let it out that his mutuality is just another name for love. Yes, altruism is love, and love is altruism, and that is all we know on earth and all we need to know.

What is the origin of the phrase 'Carte Blanche'? What is the origin of 'Killed by Kindness'?

'Yankee Doodle'? 'Belling the Cat'? 'Burking it'? All these phrases, and nearly twice as many more, are explained in a book called *Whys and Wherefores*, of which the author is Violet M. Methley (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d. net). And the author is not content to write for information. She writes also for entertainment. It is in its measure the discovery of the royal road to knowledge. For there is no boy or girl who will resist the fascination of these well-told tales.

We know a good deal about the writings of Brother Lawrence, and after his example we have tried with some measure of success the Practice of the Presence of God. But of *The Life of Brother Lawrence* we know very little, and we are grateful to the Rev. Septimus Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Seal, Sevenoaks, for taking the trouble to gather together all that is known about it. The volume which is published by Messrs. Skeffington (3s. net) contains not only the facts of Brother Lawrence's life, but also a strong recommendation to the practice of the presence of God fortified by well-chosen quotations from the Countess of Pembroke, Richard le Gallienne, Henry Francis Lyte. The volume ends with that very modern poem 'Christ in Flanders,' and with Dolben's not quite so modern 'Homo factus est.'

The Rev. Bernard M. Hancock, Vicar of St. James's, Southampton, seems during the war to have passed through his hands something like 7,000,000 British and American soldiers, and he preached to them, to as many of them as his voice could reach. He preached (if these are his sermons in the book called *Fellowship is Life*) the most unconventional sermons likely to have been heard from an English pulpit. In one of them a drunken hop-picker tells his story in his own dialect. It is a sermon on behalf of the Hop-pickers' Mission, and its effectiveness is undeniable. But perhaps Mr. Hancock did not preach all the papers. The paper on the Anglican Clergyman, for example—it is not likely that he preached that. Nor the paper on 'Wanted, More Bishops!' The book is published by Messrs. Skeffington (5s. net).

Hilda Parham, the author of *Power from on High* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net), modestly describes her book as 'Readings for Whitsuntide.' It is a volume on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Let it rather be

called a volume on the practice of the Holy Spirit. For it is not theology that interests this author, it is not any skill in nice definitions that distinguishes her. Her one desire is that the gift of the Holy Ghost, so graciously bestowed, should not be disowned or despised by us, but should be offered every oppor-

tunity of exercise, in order that in us and through us the Kingdom of God may come and His will may be done in earth as it is in heaven. It is power that is promised, it is power that we need, it is the practice of the Holy Spirit that brings power, both for sacrifice and for service.

## Suggestions toward a New Liturgical 'Credo.'

BY A. G. HOGG, M.A., PROFESSOR OF MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE IN  
MADRAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE.

### II.

#### The Commentary.

BEFORE commenting on the Tentative Draft of a New Liturgical *Credo* which I brought forward in my first article, let me repeat the Draft itself.

I BELIEVE ) in God, the Father everlasting, almighty  
I PUT MY TRUST ) to deliver ;  
                    in Jesus Christ, our only Saviour and Lord,  
                    Who hath washed us from our sins in  
                    His own blood ;  
                    in the Holy Ghost,  
                    Who helpeth our infirmity, working in  
                    us that which is pleasing in His sight,  
                    and maketh us members one of another,  
                    and partakers together in the tribulation  
                    and kingdom and patience  
                    which are in Jesus.

According to His promise I look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,  
and I know Whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day.

I have urged that a liturgical *Credo* ought to be exclusively an expression and confession of faith and not of doctrinal persuasion, of belief *in* God and not of beliefs *about* Him, and that to this end it must confine itself to saying Whom we trust, what we experimentally know Him to be doing or to have done for us and for our fellow-believers, and what we trust Him to do further for us and for the world. Now the doctrine of the Trinity as such is, of course, a belief *about* God, but it is a belief about God built around certain distinctions of phase which are found in our belief *in* God and our experience of Him. In the Christian's worship of God the tone or quality of his spiritual attitude varies according as he approaches Him as One

who did not need the sacrifice on Calvary to persuade Him to be Fatherly, since love pertains to His eternal essence, or as he meets Him face to face in the human lineaments of One who so fulfils his uttermost need and transcends his most critical inquisition that perforce he bends the knee in adoration, or as he recognizes Him in the new spontaneity of regenerate thought and emotion and impulse which is so different from his old life as to exact the confession, 'It is no more I that live.' Hence no *Credo* that did not contain a threefold designation of the God whom we worship could be adequate to express our attitude of faith in the living movement of its alternating phases. But, on the other hand, to include in the *Credo*, whether directly or by implication, any view as to how it is possible for the eyes of our faith, in these three phases of immediate vision, to be having the intuition of but one God, would be to pass beyond the effort to provide an expression of that interweaving of vision and trust and loyalty which constitute belief *in* God and to enter upon the effort to reach definition of belief *about* God. Now the doctrine of the Trinity is just such a definition of 'belief about,' and that is why the draft submitted above avoids direct use of the Trinitarian formula, 'God the Father,' 'God the Son,' and 'God the Holy Ghost.' It may or may not be the case that faith in the Divinity of Christ cannot be *logical* except in a mind that has learned to accept that belief about God which we call the doctrine of the Trinity; but whether or not such faith cannot be logical, it can certainly be *actual*



without the help of that belief; and the *Credo* here desiderated aims at expressing the actuality of faith and not at defining its logic. To avoid an indirect suggestion of tritheistic belief I dispense with any 'and' between the three designations, 'God, the Father everlasting,' 'Jesus Christ,' and 'the Holy Ghost.' On the other hand, the fact that the three designations all denote God is sufficiently indicated by their being grouped under the one phrase, 'I believe in' (or, 'I put my trust in'), since this phrase is here reserved for one use only and is not, as in the Apostles' Creed, indiscriminately extended to our attitude to the Church and to doctrines. It appears to me that this omission of 'and' and grouping of three designations under one 'I believe in' is a not unsuccessful device for expressing the actuality of the attitude of Christian belief in God. For that actuality is an immediate or unreasoned thing; faith's direct vision of God is a triplicity which is not noticed to be triplex, and again it is a unity which is not noticed to differ from the triplicity. If the *Credo* were to stress either the triplicity or the unity or both, it would introduce a greater degree of implication of 'belief about' than is indispensable for the adequate expression and confession of 'belief in' God.

*The Father everlasting, almighty to deliver.* These phrases seek to express the first of the three phases distinguished above in the attitude of our faith in God. This is the positive consideration governing the choice of characterization here; the negative consideration is the need of limiting the inevitable doctrinal implication to those beliefs by which faith is nourished, and of excluding even the implication of those more debatable beliefs by which faith has been defended. Why follow the Apostles' Creed in describing God as 'Maker of heaven and earth,' when reflexion has immediately to step in and explain that the 'making' in question is not really 'making,' or even 'creating' if the latter is conceived as a temporal act? Again, the general conception of omnipotence is one which has given opening to debate and disagreement. What is vital to the religious consciousness is not any belief that God has power to achieve anything and everything no matter how inconceivable, but simply that He can be depended on to the uttermost for the safeguarding and achievement of the ends and interests which faith has at heart. He is 'almighty to deliver the soul' that trusts in Him

from every real evil. That conviction is sufficient for faith or trust to feed on; anything less would be insufficient.

*Jesus Christ, our only Saviour and Lord.* This phase aims at expressing what I take to be the experimental content of the dogma of Christ's Divinity. I believe that many professed Unitarians are really genuine disciples of our Lord who have been hindered by theoretical confusions from applying to Him the Divine name; on the other hand, I believe that among the members of Trinitarian Churches there are many who are actually Unitarian in their thought, although they have either lacked courage or felt no obligation to sunder themselves from the communions to which they belong. And it seems to me that in this matter the real dividing line between those who have attained to full discipleship of our Lord and those who have stopped short of this is constituted not by willingness to employ the term 'God the Son,' but by the degree of their surrender to and trust in Christ. Does a man know no hope for himself but in Christ? Has Christ so conquered him that he cannot help bowing before Him as Lord, that is, as One to whose judgment in matters of religious truth and moral duty his own judgment has come to feel that it must, and safely may, submit itself? If the answer be affirmative, that man is a genuine disciple of our Lord in the full New Testament sense, even though on theoretical grounds he may not see his way to ascribe to Christ complete Divinity. To most of us his position may appear illogical. Naturally one argues that to trust in Christ as one's only Saviour, and to recognize in Him an authority extending even over one's judgment, is irrational unless one believes Him to be 'very God.' But in the *Credo* for which I am pleading the aim is not to rationalize faith but to find for it a common expression; and why should we so phrase this common expression as to exclude from the use of it one whose faith is that of a real disciple simply because his faith has not yet learned to define itself logically?

Indeed, to myself the above phrase of the *Credo* appears to need defence rather through what it includes than through what it omits. The doctrine of Christ's metaphysical Divinity as second Person of the Trinity, being one of the beliefs by which faith defends itself rather than by one which it nourishes itself, cannot easily claim a place in a *Credo* which seeks to express belief in God in

Christ and not beliefs *about* Him. But it may easily seem to a critic that by introducing the word 'only' before 'Saviour,' the phrase under discussion intrudes a wholly superfluous element of 'belief about.' Why, it may be asked, should those who are seeking to express their belief in Christ go out of their way to state a conviction regarding the incompetence of any other religion to provide a real way of salvation?

Now, if this were the actual intention of the 'only,' no answer to the criticism would be possible. But neither is it the intention nor is it a fair interpretation. The words 'our only' must be read together. They are intended to express what becomes matter of immediate knowledge for every one who has perceived God in Christ and has surrendered to Him. Having once known Christ, such a one feels that no other Saviour could suffice for him, that no other Gospel could conceivably meet his need. Outside Christianity, and before Christ is inwardly apprehended, a soul may find in some less adequate revelation that which enables it to trust God and surrender self-will in simple confidence; and to such trust and surrender, however mediated, the Heavenly Father will surely respond. But it is characteristic of the revelation of God in Christ that, in being apprehended, it so quickens the soul's moral sensibilities that henceforth none other than Christ can bridge for it the chasm between God and the sinner which Christ has revealed; for such a soul He is henceforth the 'only Saviour.' This personal certainty of the Saviour's uniqueness is one of the typical notes of living Christian faith, and ought to find expression in the *Credo*.

*Who hath washed . . . blood.* I think it would be hypercriticism to object that in this clause there is more intrusion of 'belief about' than is indispensable to an expression of 'belief in' a God whose forgiveness is morally irreproachable. The words do not suggest any particular theory of the kind of connexion between Christ's death and the permissibility of pardon, and that there is a connexion of some kind between the two is an experimental Christian certainty. Historically the intuition of the presence of some kind of connexion antedates even the rise of the Pauline theology, as is evident from 1 Co 15<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, the affirmation of a connexion cannot be relegated to the category of merely 'defensive' beliefs. On the contrary, the connexion has been for theory a

problem rather than a support, since it is the characteristic temptation of mere theological theory to fail of adequately realizing the moral obstacles to forgiveness. That we are 'bought with a price,' and a price which includes Calvary, is the most outstanding of the beliefs on which Christian faith nourishes itself, and no *Credo* from which this conception was excluded could be a satisfying expression of that faith.

*In the Holy Ghost . . . His sight.* This clause appears to need no defence, its character of experimental testimony being obvious. In the form in which I first conceived this draft of a *Credo*, the description of the Spirit's work in the soul went no further, and there was thus a more symmetrical balance between the expressions of faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit than there is in the draft as I here present it.

*And maketh us . . . which are in Jesus.* The purpose which I have had in view in emending my first draft by the insertion of this clause is to meet, so far as I can, the criticism of those who will be disposed to find any *Credo* unsatisfactory in which there is no explicit reference to the Church. I myself feel no urgent need of introducing such a reference, because, to my thinking, the right attitude of the believer to the Church is so perfectly expressed in and through the act of reciting together one universally accepted *Credo* as to render the inclusion of any specific clause about the Church superfluous, even if an appropriate one can be devised. The essence of the Church is a supernatural endowment shared, and a spiritual fellowship created, through a common but individually reappropriated faith in a common but individually accepted Lord and Saviour. Hence I can conceive no better way of bringing to vivid consciousness and giving expression to our relation to the Church than the pregnant act of confessing together, in the same terms, who it is that we individually put our trust in, what it is that we individually find Him to have done and to be doing for us and for our fellow-believers, and what it is that we trust Him to do further for us and for the world. The Church is not the object of religious faith but is its consequence, and so if any clause were to be included like: 'I believe in the holy Catholic Church,' the words, 'I believe in,' must not be used in the sense of 'I put my trust in' or 'rest my soul upon,' but in some other sense which it would be necessary to distinguish.



This appears to me to constitute a serious difficulty in the way of including in the proposed 'expression of faith' a substantive proposition dealing with the Church. But there is not the same objection to a consequential inclusion. For the idea of the Church, which is implicit in the very conception and use of a common *Credo*, is also to be given the explicitness of a specific reference, then the principle determining the manner of this reference must be, so it seems to me, that which has just been mentioned, namely, that the Church stands to religious faith in the relation not of object but of consequence. It was through faith in God in Christ that the first disciples became our Lord's new Israel, His *ecclesia*, His Church; it is through faith in God in Christ that we to-day become members of the Church; it is through faith in God in Christ that the Church appropriates and ever reappropriates that supernatural endowment without which it would not be the Church. In short, faith in God in Christ is the human condition of that operation of the Holy Spirit in and through which the Church comes into being, acts, and grows. Hence the fit place in the *Credo* for a reference to the Church seems to be as part of the clause expressing the content of our faith in the Holy Spirit. And in such a context I cannot think of any more perfect way of expressing in Scriptural language that intimate reality of Church-membership of which the individual is conscious in the act of faith and worship than those phrases from Rev 1<sup>9</sup> which I have embodied in the draft *Credo*.

The words were not intended by St. John as a definition of the essence of the Church, and yet they supply an excellent definition. When what has to be analysed is an inward spiritual reality, the conscious effort to define often militates against a successful definition. The effort superinduces the reflective attitude of mind, and thereby relegates to the background of consciousness the very content of emotion, hope, trust, and loyalty, every phase of which the definition ought to seize. In the passage in question, on the other hand, St. John has no idea of enunciating a definition, and yet in effect he is unconsciously trying to provide one: for he is setting forth the claim to a hearing which is conferred on him by his participation in all that unites Christians into a distinctive supernatural community—in short, by his membership of the one Catholic Church. They and he are partakers

together in the tribulation which is in Jesus—the tribulations of the Church militant, in the Kingdom which is in Jesus, that is, the supernatural privileges which belong to the sons of God and which so alter for them all the problems of life that they can never think and feel and resolve exactly as do the sons of this world, and consequently can never feel themselves wholly citizens of its states, but are conscious of a higher citizenship and instinctively come together as members of a distinctive spiritual community and participators in a distinctive endeavour. And further they and he are partakers in the patience which is in Jesus—the patience which is eager to give the barren fig-tree a longer reprieve, which is willing to wait longer for the glories that are to come until the harvest is ripe and their yet unredeemed brothers are by grace made fit to share with them in the great enfranchisement.

*According to His promise . . . righteousness.* From statements as to Whom we trust, and what we find Him to have done and to be doing for us and our fellow-believers, the *Credo* here passes on to state what we trust Him to do further for us and for the world. And, as is fitting, the social hope receives precedence of expression. It is, I believe, fundamentally characteristic of authentic Christianity that its praxis is a service of God *in the world*, that its love for God issues in a new appreciation of the universe of His creation, and a longing for the preservation and perfecting of everything in it that is good, and that the ideal to which it looks forward is not such an absorption in the vision face to face as shall blot out from consciousness all recollection of other finite being, but is rather such an immediacy of knowledge of the Father and Creator as shall bind the individual in a more intimate union with the children of His love and with the outer creation in which is His delight. The idea of a wholly immaterial 'heaven' is a hybrid product due to Hellenistic influences. The New Testament expectation, on the other hand, is of the coming of an etherealized universe, less grossly material than the present world-order and yet not immaterial. But the issue of real spiritual importance is not whether the environment of the life eternal is to be material or immaterial, but whether it is to include the fruition of all that is really precious in the universe as we know it. The conviction that it is to be indeed a plane of real fruition and vigorous life, instead of a shadow-

land of impotent regret and brooding memory, is the kernel of spiritual value possessed by the affirmation of the resurrection of the body which is made by the Apostles' Creed, but the conception of this fruition is far more adequately expressed in the words from 2 P 3<sup>18</sup>, embodied in the draft *Credo*.

*And I know . . . against that day.* If the preceding sentence of the *Credo* corresponds to the affirmation of the 'resurrection of the body' in the Apostles' Creed, this concluding sentence corresponds to its affirmation of 'the life everlasting.' More than upon any proof-texts, more even than upon the resurrection of our Lord, the Christian's ability to believe in his own personal immortality rests upon his knowledge of God in Christ as One who so loves him as to be unwilling that death or any other power should snatch him out of His hand. It is therefore fitting that the *Credo* should express its hope of immortality in language which directly connects that hope with the speaker's own personal knowledge of God's love in Christ Jesus. When the 'new heavens and a new earth' of the New Testament hope arrive, the 'last enemy,' Death, will have been abolished. He who reaches that day will be in no further danger of mortality, for in the New Testament conception all mortal risks lie on the hither side thereof. Hence the stirring words in which St. Paul confesses his persuasion that He whom he knows and trusts is able to keep that which he has committed unto Him 'against that day' may be employed without unnatural distortion to express the believer's assured hope of life for evermore.

At the beginning of this article an attempt was made to reply in advance to certain anticipated criticisms. It was natural to discuss these at the outset because they were founded on misconceptions, the clearing up of which would help to make plain the point of view inspiring this plea for a new kind of *Credo*. But there is a possible criticism of another kind which it is natural to deal with at the end of the article rather than at the beginning, because it is not due to misunderstanding but suggests itself only when the nature of the contemplated *Credo* has been clearly grasped. One way of putting this possible objection may be as follows. Just because an ordinary Creed aims at a statement of beliefs rather than an expression of faith, one may call for its public recitation without

harm, because the great majority of the attendant worshippers do sincerely, even if unintelligently, assent to these beliefs, and the others have the option of keeping silence. But can it be said that the great majority of Church-goers possess the living faith and experience which a *Credo* of the kind illustrated proposes to express? And if the answer be in the negative, does it not follow that to include such a *Credo* in a liturgy for use in public worship would be to provide an incitement to hypocrisy?

In reply to this objection I would, while admitting the moral difficulty of the point it raises, draw attention to the fact that its application is far wider than simply to the use of a *Credo* of the kind suggested. For the very same ground of objection would exclude from use in public worship very many of the best hymns. If the objection is a valid one, I would be prepared to alter the opening sentence of this paper and to make it express instead a wish for the recitation of one and the same *Credo* at every communion service of every denomination. But in that case I should also have to contend that only at communion services should those hymns be sung which spring from the heart of living Christian experience and true faith. On the other hand, if it be held that such hymns may rightly be used at ordinary public worship, in spite of the danger of giving occasion to hypocrisy, then the same must logically be admitted regarding a *Credo* of the new kind proposed.

Throughout this article it has not been so much argued as assumed that the adoption of a common *Credo* for use in public worship is an object worthy of earnest endeavour. Is it safe to treat this assumption as self-evident? If it is not self-evident, I doubt whether argument can make it so. The longing for a really universal *Credo* is one which those who, like myself, have been brought up in Churches possessing no liturgy and reciting no Creed at public worship, have to grow into, and where the longing is not already felt, it is not likely to be created by mere reasoning. But if reasoning is asked for, I would refer to a point I have urged already, namely, that there can be no better way of bringing to consciousness and expressing our sense of membership in one universal Church than the pregnant act of confessing together, in the same terms, who it is that we individually trust, what it is that we individually find Him to have done and to be doing for us and for our fellow-believers,



and what it is that we trust Him to do further for us and for the world. And I would add that community in manner of worship—the use of a common hymnal, the recitation of a common *Credo*, and the conduct of at least some part of the regular meetings for worship according to a common liturgy—seems to me calculated to do far

more towards promoting the real unity of the Churches than the federation of their government or the construction of common doctrinal formularies. Both in methods of organization and in the formulation of defensive doctrinal beliefs it is healthy to differ; but in faith it is our duty, and so in worship it is our gain, to be at one.

## In the Study.

### THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

#### Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

#### THE GARMENT AND THE SWORD.

'He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one.'—Lk 22<sup>36</sup>.

1. THE garment is the symbol of *Luxury*. On it is lavished much of the wealth and splendour of life. 'You can tell a man by his clothes.' So the Christian soldier must often dispense with life's luxuries, if he would win life's crown. He may not say much against these. They may be harmless enough in themselves. But for himself he feels that before he can buy his sword he must cast these away. He feels, *e.g.*, that he is in such a line of business with such temptations in it that his only way of safety is the way of total abstinence from these things. Or perhaps, better still, he cannot as a father see his children grow up to trifle with these dangerous indulgences by following his example. Or best of all, he cannot speak to a poor brother who is going down to ruin by the indulgence of what is only a harmless luxury to himself. And so with no violent feelings against the thing in itself, he yet feels it his duty, nay his necessity, to put away this thing. He must sell the garment of luxury to buy the sword of victory.<sup>1</sup>

2. Again, the garment is the symbol of *Comfort*. We don't put on clothes primarily to look well. We put them on to keep out the cold wind and the chill rain. So we are taught here the still more searching truth, that so strenuous is the Christian struggle that sometimes a man must be prepared to sacrifice not merely his luxuries but his comforts as well to win it.

<sup>1</sup> W. Mackintosh Mackay.

It has been truly remarked that we cannot improve the future without disturbing the present. Established wrongs can only be put right by upheavals of the public mind corresponding in some degree with the magnitude of the evil to be combated. The gales that blow away the leaves and purify the air are God's disinfectants. The temporary inconvenience and local damage they inflict are more than compensated by the universal good. Who can calculate how many epidemics they prevent? The air that is least stagnant is most healthy. The unwholesome quiet of the 'Black Hole' is the prelude of suffocation. Better perish in a tornado than stifle in a dungeon. Death, if postponed for a while, is equally sure and still more agonizing.<sup>2</sup>

3. Once again, the garment is the symbol of *Propriety* or *Respectability*. Christ would teach us here that there are times when, in attacking some great public abuse, a man may have to speak and act with a plainness that will shock the public mind. This is a delicate subject, and there will always be difference of opinion on special cases. Such, *e.g.*, as the way Mr. Stead took up the question of public purity, many years ago in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Without expressing an opinion on individual cases, we lay down a great principle, that there are times when a man, in his battle for righteousness, may be compelled to cast away the garment of propriety that he may buy the sword of victory.

It is said that St. Francis' father once took him to court on the plea that his son had left his house and taken his father's property with him. 'What have I taken?' said Francis. 'Why, the very clothes on your back are mine,' said the father. 'Then,' said the great renunciant, 'I give them back!' and disappearing out of the court he returned with the garments a few moments later, stark naked. 'We Christians,' said Hugh Price Hughes once, 'must make ourselves a public nuisance, till we have put down every other nuisance.' That is perhaps the best modern setting of this parable. In our battle for purity and righteousness,

<sup>2</sup> F. de L. Booth-Tucker, *The Life of Catherine Booth*, i. 248.

we must be ready, like the old British tars, to strip to the waist as we go into action; we must, like the old Hebrew prophets, be prepared to sacrifice even the garment of propriety, that we may wield the sword of the Lord and of victory.<sup>1</sup>

It is a pathetic sight and a striking example of the complexity introduced into the emotions by a high state of civilization—the sight of a fashionably drest female in grief. From the sorrow of a Hottentot to that of a woman in large buckram sleeves, with several bracelets on each arm, an architectural bonnet, and delicate ribbon-strings—what a long series of gradations! In the enlightened child of civilization the abandonment characteristic of grief is checked and varied in the subtlest manner, so as to present an interesting problem to the analytic mind. If, with a crushed heart and eyes half-blinded by the mist of tears, she were to walk with a too devious step through a door-place, she might crush her buckram sleeves too, and the deep consciousness of this possibility produces a composition of forces by which she takes a line that just clears the door-post. Perceiving that the tears are hurrying fast, she unpins her strings and throws them languidly backward—a touching gesture, indicative, even in the deepest gloom, of the hope in future dry moments when cap-strings will once more have a charm. As the tears subside a little, and with her head leaning backward at the angle that will not injure her bonnet, she endures that terrible moment when grief, which has made all things else a weariness, has itself become weary; she looks down pensively at her bracelets, and adjusts their clasps with that pretty studied fortuity which would be gratifying to her mind if it were once more in a calm and healthy state.<sup>2</sup>

#### Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.

##### PURSUIT.

‘Follow after righteousness.’—2 Ti 2<sup>22</sup>.

This word ‘follow’ is elsewhere translated ‘persecute.’ Go after goodness with the intensity and fierceness of a hound following up a scent. Follow after righteousness, which Paul defines as godliness, with faith (here in a sense of fidelity). Godliness is a thing we are inclined in our day to forget in defining righteousness.

##### 1. Where is it?

(1) It is above us. I used to see the boats going out from Newcastle Quay to places where the magnetic currents in the water made sailing dangerous, as they would deflect the compass, and these boats would take [an extra compass fixed somewhere high up above the influence of these disturbing powers. So we often come into currents—expediency, prejudice, ‘conclusions hastily formed,’ and other mesmeric and magnetic in-

fluences—so take your life into the altitudes where these will not affect it, let your righteousness be first the rights of God; you cannot be righteous only on the lower planes, get near God!<sup>3</sup>

(2) It is beside us. When we are righteous to God, when we respect God’s rights, then we will be righteous to men, respecting our neighbour’s rights.

Grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life. Righteousness is the great end of Christ’s sacrifice. Through righteousness alone we get eternal life. It is more difficult to live a healthy life and be a Christian than to be a Christian in affliction. Grace begins by an inward renewal followed by an outward change. Sacrifice is the measure of love. There can be no love without self-sacrifice.<sup>4</sup>

##### 2. How is the pursuit maintained?

(1) By Love. To follow righteousness without the gracious medium of love is hard and unfruitful work, but if a man is upright and loving his following will be all right! What is Love? It is a certain attitude of soul, the kindly eye, the generous judgment. It must begin by being a mental attitude, the pose of goodwill, of benevolence, and the pose creates a disposition! The emotions follow the mind. ‘Set your affections’ in the old Version becomes ‘Set your mind’ in the Revised, and if we follow the Revised we produce the Authorized! Look for the lovely, the beautiful, in your brother. Give all his actions a fair interpretation, and soon in your heart there will come the very love of Jesus Christ!

Would you know God? I say to you, discover what true love means. Get your heart so full of it that it will send you forth in God’s Spirit seeking to save the lost, yearning to redeem the erring and sinful, binding up the broken-hearted, drying streaming eyes, and comforting them that mourn; get such a love as that into your soul, and you need look no further for an image of God. Moreover not only is it true that every one that loveth knoweth God, but it is equally true that you will know God just to the extent that you really love and no more.<sup>5</sup>

(2) By Patience. You cannot get very far without that. The patience of God is so wonderful. In only three years, so soon past, how much time He spent over one woman at the well of Samaria; how much on Nicodemus; how much on the slow, stupid disciples! He waited for the lagging pupil; for the slowest in the group. As Isaiah said, ‘And gently lead those that are with young’; the

<sup>3</sup> J. H. Jowett.

<sup>4</sup> John Brown Paton: *A Biography*, 370.

<sup>5</sup> *Quintin Hogg: A Biography*, 304.

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Mackay, *Words of this Life*, 89.

<sup>2</sup> George Eliot.



weakest, the slowest, are to set the pace for the flock!

It was a characteristic of Fénelon that he bore the passions and faults of others with the greatest equanimity. He was faithful, without ceasing to be patient. Believing that the providence of God attaches to times as well as to things, and that there is a time for reproof as well as for everything else, a time which may properly be denominated *God's time*, he waited calmly for the proper moment of speaking. Thus he kept his own spirit in harmony with God.<sup>1</sup>

(3) By Meekness. What is that? When the old Greeks took a young foal from his wild galloping round the field, and put a yoke round his neck, they called him 'meek.' Meekness is power harnessed to a useful purpose. 'I came to minister'; 'he that would be great let him be your minister.' Let him get the yoke on, and serve! No more licentious scampering round the field, or the world. Get into collar and serve! 'My yoke is easy,' says Christ, and men and women are just burdened in spirit because they are not meek. Take up some one else's load and your own will be light.

There was a poor woman who having become, under God's grace, rich in faith, bore much misfortune with the meekness and patience of an angel. By her personal labours she supported both her five children and her husband. Her poverty was extreme; her suffering from other causes great; but amid her trials and distractions, she kept constantly recollected in God; and her tranquillity of spirit was unbroken. When she prayed, there was something wonderful in it. Two deeply religious men, intimate friends with each other, learning the situation of the poor laundress, had agreed to visit her in turn, and to render her some assistance by reading to her. But they were surprised to learn, that she was already instructed by the Lord Himself in all they read to her. God, they found, had taught her inwardly by the Holy Ghost, before He had sent, in His providence, the outward aid of books and pious friends to confirm His inward communications. So much was this the case, that they were willing to receive instruction from her. Her words seemed Divine.<sup>2</sup>

### Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

#### CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

'For the perfecting of the saints.'—Eph 4<sup>12</sup>.

Christian perfection or true saintliness is nothing else than the perfection of the man, the reaching the full growth of the man according to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that is to say, the rightful use of all the faculties which God

gave to man, in the way and to the ends for which God gave them, and no otherwise.

1. It is *perfection in the intellect*, comprising wisdom, a right judgment, knowledge, especially the knowledge of the Son of God, and of His love which passeth knowledge, enlightenment of the understanding for the perception of Divine mysteries, comprehension of God's revealed purposes, and withal a manly strength of mind to hold fast the truth which has once been received, and to reject enticing novelties.

When John Knox and his coadjutors gave Scotland a religious life instead of a form, they unloosed the Scottish intellect, to make it then and ever since one of the great intellectual forces of the world. There has never been a great revival that has not had a higher mentality as an after-product. The second or third generation that trace back to it may change their attitude to the belief of their fathers, may even adopt a hostile one. All the same, it remains that the deep, inward movement at the beginning is the hidden source of the mental products that succeed. When you turn men from frivolity and vice to depth and seriousness of character, you have fructified not only the world's soul, but all its powers.<sup>3</sup>

2. It is *perfection in the moral qualities of the soul*, comprising aptitude for communion with God, a close union with Christ, faith, love, kindness, tenderness, patience, forbearance, sincerity, fidelity, purity, moderation, temperance, and lowliness of mind.

Ian Maclaren preached religion rather than theology; and he lived what he preached. If he did not know the difficulties that beset men who think, he yet knew the wants of men in general. He knew the power of sympathy, and he knew that the story of the life and the death of Jesus will reach men's hearts to the end of time. And then he had mastered the evil that was in himself. No one ever knew him to be angry. Even his wife could only once remember any approach to hastiness, and it was when the servant omitted to tell him of a case of sickness to be visited. He could bear opposition; he could suffer to see himself despised or thrust aside if any good came of it. He used to buy things at a shop in Perth where the shopkeeper was not civil to him. He was asked why he continued to go where his custom was not wanted; and he answered that he was trying to soften that man by kindness.<sup>4</sup>

3. It is *perfection in the actual conduct of life*, comprising constant and unwearied prayer and intercession; the preservation of unbroken union with the Body of Christ into which he has been baptized; peaceful relations with all men; right-

<sup>3</sup> J. Brierley, *Religion and To-day*, 82.

<sup>4</sup> W. Robertson Nicoll, *Ian Maclaren: Life of the Rev. John Watson, D.D.*, 19.

<sup>1</sup> T. C. Upham, *The Life of Madame Guyon*, 454.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 187.

eousness and honesty in all his dealings; industry in working the thing that is good; charity in helping the necessities of the poor; the careful husbanding of precious time; the conscientious employment of the great gift of speech; and the faithful discharge of all the relative duties of life, as wives or as husbands, as children or as parents, as servants or as masters; and all for the sake of Christ.

Theoretical theology is valuable only as it bears on the practical conduct of life.<sup>1</sup>

### Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.

CALLED.

'And called.'—Jude<sup>1</sup>.

1. When we think of Vocation we nearly always begin by thinking of some work we choose to do, from some motive higher than just satisfying our own personal likes and dislikes, but if we take the meaning of the word—'a calling or summons'—we realize that we do not choose; we are chosen. What difference did this new relationship with Christ make to Jude? It meant that his life now had taken on new values—it had become something to be lived every minute, in every thought and every deed for Christ. It had become a 'vocation.' A vocation, then, is not just some special work we do, but also the living of the whole of our life for Christ. It is a new relationship out of which come the many and separate 'calls.' It is not merely 'doing' something, but also an attitude of mind towards everything we do.

#### 2. What is the spirit of the vocation?

(1) It is the spirit of loving *sympathy*. Jesus, Paul, St. Francis, Mary Slessor, John Woolman, and many others whose lives were 'called' to the service of God, were all passionately and intensely in love with humanity. Without this love our work is useless.

What a strange thing is sympathy! Undefined, untranslatable, and yet the most real thing and the greatest power in human life! How strangely our souls leap out to some other soul without our choosing or knowing the why. The man or woman who has this subtle gift of sympathy and magnetism of soul possesses the most precious thing on earth. Hence it is rare. So few could be trusted with such a delicate, sensitive, Godlike power and hold it unsullied that God seems

to be hampered for want of means for its expression. Is that the reason that He made His Son a 'Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief'?<sup>2</sup>

(2) The spirit of *humility*. We must be willing to learn from those among whom we work. If the call shall come to us to be missionaries, let us go out seeking points of contact, willing to give but also to receive; if to be social workers, let us be prepared to learn much of generosity, courage, long-suffering, and real Christianity expressed in ways that are unusual and perhaps uncouth to us; if the call is to bring us among 'ordinary' people coming in this spirit, we shall find them not 'ordinary' but 'wonderful.'

The first personal impression Dr. Cairns made on all who met him was one of wonder at his humility. It came out in ways so unstudied, and in degree, judging by common standards, so excessive, as sometimes to arouse incredulity and provoke a smile. These, however, were in their way striking tributes to the beauty of this grace. For the thought underlying them was—how can so great a man, consistently with perfect ingenuousness, display such lowliness and speak in such generous exaltation of tone, about commonplace achievements and inferior men?<sup>3</sup>

(3) The spirit of *sincerity*. This implies truthfulness in our thoughts as well as in our acts. When the time shall come for us to enter into our 'vocation,' let us be quite sure that we are willing to go where God shall send us, not slipping into the first avenue of service that offers, and then convincing ourselves that this is our appointed work. Let us make quite sure that the motives for work are really what we think they are.

Sincerity is not so easy a task as some people think; it is not easy at all to be sure that one tells the truth, even if one tries, either to others or to oneself. There are those who hold bluntly that the essence of Christianity is deliberate self-deception—not very historically, for if character is ever to be read at all, it is plain that in few societies have there been so many persons as in the Christian Church diaphanously candid with themselves, in self-criticism and in apprehension of truth.<sup>4</sup>

(4) The spirit of *simplicity*. The Christian ought to be simple enough to be recognized as a disciple by all with whom he comes in contact. Our mode of thought, of life, and of speech should raise no barriers. Let us remember this against the time when our call shall come.

<sup>2</sup> Mary Slessor of Calabar, 288.

<sup>3</sup> Life and Letters of John Cairns, D.D., LL.D., 600.

<sup>4</sup> T. R. Glover, Vocation, 61.

<sup>1</sup> Lyman Abbott, *Reminiscences*, 19.



Four things a man must learn to do  
 If we would make his record true :  
 To think without confusion, clearly ;  
 To love his fellow-men sincerely ;  
 To act from honest motives purely ;  
 To trust in God and heaven securely.<sup>1</sup>

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

SEPTEMBER.

#### A Thanksgiving Feast.

'The feast of ingathering at the year's end.'—Ex 34<sup>22</sup>.

A little girl was feeling very happy one day at the prospect of visiting an aunt who lived in a big city. She could scarcely sleep the night before for thinking of all the wonderful things she would see. Next morning she kept chattering to her uncle about her joy, when he suddenly asked, 'Have you said "Thank you" this morning?' 'I have nothing to say "Thank you" for,' said the little girl. 'This dress is quite old, my hat is old. I have nothing new at all.' 'But, Annie,' answered the old gentleman, 'think how well you are, and what lovely weather you are going to have for your journey. If these things had been different, you could not have gone to visit your aunt.' The child looked 'put out,' and stammered, 'I never thought of that; I'll go and say "Thank you."'

'Thank God for every little thing,' a clergyman wrote to a friend at Easter-time. In the same letter he told about a Hawaiian girl who 'could not see a flower without thanking God for it,' and then he added, 'Thank God for the blue skies when you have them, and the flowers as they unfold, and think "How wonderful it is that God should have made all this beauty for me."'

Robert Louis Stevenson, that delightful writer of books, seemed to believe that it was in people's hearts to be thankful. He wrote the life of a Professor whom he knew and loved; in that Memoir there is a beautiful word-picture of the Professor's old father. He was a sea-captain. When he had become very old and frail, he said one day, 'I want you to work something, Annie. An anchor at each side—an anchor—stands for an old sailor, you know—stands for hope, you know—an anchor at each side, and in the middle

THANKFUL.'

Robert Louis must have been a thankful little chap himself when he was a boy. Some of you know his 'Child's Garden of Verse.' Do you remember this verse?

<sup>1</sup> Henry Van Dyke.

It is very nice to think  
 The world is full of meat and drink,  
 With little children saying grace  
 In every Christian kind of place.

And

The world is so full of a number of things,  
 I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings.

I remember seeing a very old farmer who, I feel sure, was just about as thankful as the sea-captain. He was presiding at a harvest-home supper, or, as your text speaks of it, a Feast of Ingathering. His farm was quite a small one—it was but a croft, in fact—and the farmhouse a thatched cottage. Above the supper-table there were rafters blackened with peat-smoke, for the dining-hall was a kitchen, with a peat fire. But the company at the table was a truly happy one. Both the old farmer and his wife looked kindly on their guests; they, in turn, were glad because the plentiful harvest had been safely brought in. I think an artist could have made a fine picture of that harvest supper party. The two or three women, the farmer's wife included, wore cotton print dresses, and the old man a red woollen night-cap. So, with the peat fire, the black rafters, the supper-table, and the company there was a wonderful combination of colour. But apart from all that, on the old farmer's part at least, it was a feast of thankfulness to God. One could tell that by the reverent way in which he said grace. When supper was over there came the reading of a chapter from the Bible and the singing of a harvest psalm. It was part of the sixty-fifth. One verse they sang was:

So thou the year most liberally  
 Dost with thy goodness crown;  
 And all thy paths abundantly  
 On us drop fatness down.

Then prayer followed. Such harvest-homes, I feel sorry to say, have gone out of fashion. People may be thankful without saying much or indeed without saying anything at all. Boys and girls know that. But the world would not get on very well if every one were silent when they felt sorry or when they felt glad or thankful.

Once when there was a great cotton famine in Lancashire, the mills were idle for months, and there was a great deal of distress among the people. But one day there came the first load of cotton, which meant that the opportunity to earn their

daily bread was returning again. The workers met the wagon and formed a triumphant procession in front of it. Oh, how glad the people were; they hugged the bales of cotton, and seemed almost frenzied with joy. Then, as though moved by a common impulse, they broke into singing, 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow.' That was better than silence, was it not? Have you boys and girls nothing that you can thank God for? I know you have. Then, why not thank Him? A missionary heard a little boy say that he knew he had a great deal to thank God for, but, somehow, he did not feel thankful. 'Do you ever tell God that you know you have many mercies?' the missionary asked. 'Why, no,' the little fellow said; 'I never did thank God aloud.' 'Try it, and keep on trying,' said the missionary. The boy did. He thanked God aloud for all His gifts, and he grew so happy that after a bit he loved to thank God, because he really had a grateful heart.

Try it, boys and girls. Thank God for your health, for your friends, for your games, for what you call your 'good luck.' Thank Him for everything.

#### Upside Down and Right Side Up.

'These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.'—Ac 17<sup>6</sup>.

When we read these words I think our first inclination is to smile, just because they are such 'upside down' words themselves. Here is a city mob led by the very rabble of the city, the habitual disturbers of the peace, and they are accusing a few quiet Christian missionaries of turning the world 'upside down.' But that is often the way in this world. When people are in the wrong they are very fond of blaming those who are in the right. They think they must be in the right themselves, so, naturally, everybody else must be in the wrong.

Of course these wild men didn't care one bit whether Paul and his friends were turning the world upside down or downside up. All they cared about was having an excuse to create a little disturbance. The people who really cared were the jealous Jews who had stirred them up to make the disturbance so that they might get rid of the missionaries.

Paul, and Silas, and Timothy had come to Thessalonica, which is just the modern Salonika,

to preach the gospel. They had been showing the Jews how the prophets had foretold that Christ should suffer, and die, and rise again. But the Jews did not like their message. They had looked for a Messiah who should be an earthly king to lead them on to great victories. And they did not like the influence of the missionaries over the Greeks who had adopted the Jewish religion; for a great many of these had believed Paul's message and become his followers. They were too wily and too dignified to create a disturbance themselves, but there were plenty of lazy good-for-nothings who would be glad to do it for them. So while they remained in the background, the rabble set the city in an uproar. And this was the accusation that they put in the mouth of the mob—'These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.'

Now the Jews were nearer the truth than they thought when they accused the apostles of turning the world 'upside down,' only they made one important mistake. The poor old world was already as upside down as it possibly could be, in fact it was standing on its head; and it was the message which the apostles brought that was going to turn it right side up.

I want you to think first of what turns the world upside down, and second of what is going to put it right again.

1. And first, What turns the world upside down? Of course there is just one answer to that, and it is 'Sin.' God did not mean the world to be upside down, He meant that it should be good, and beautiful, and noble; but sin entered and spoiled it. And what turns the world upside down is just what turns *you* upside down; for the world is made up of the men and women in it. When you are angry, when you are selfish, when you are untruthful, when you are disobedient or dishonourable, you are just upside down, and you are helping to keep the world upside down too.

2. But, second, what is going to turn the world right side up? Again we can answer in one word—'Love.' Jesus Christ was just Love Incarnate, and it is the love that He sheds abroad in men's hearts that is going to set the old world right again.

When Christ came down to earth, He found things in a sad state. The Romans were the conquerors of the world in those days and were supposed to be highly civilized. Yet in the



Colosseum at Rome men were torn to pieces by wild beasts while emperors and fine ladies looked on and applauded. Tiny babies were left outside the city gates to perish of cold and hunger. And when people grew old and frail and of no more use, they, too, were turned out to die. For the weak, and the poor, and the helpless there was no pity and no help. There were no hospitals and no asylums. Slaves were over-burdened, ill-treated, tortured; and the worst of it all was that very few people thought there was anything amiss in any of these things.

But Jesus came into the world. He healed the sick, He comforted the sad, He blessed the little children. And wherever they went His followers tried to imitate Him. Gradually people came to have new ideas about things. Instead of neglecting and oppressing the weak and the helpless they began to try to help them.

And is the world still upside down? I'm afraid it is still pretty topsy-turvy, but very slowly and surely it is coming right. Sometimes we think it is going back a bit, but that is only because we are so short-sighted. God, who sees all, knows that it is coming right.

But you must do your part. Jesus Christ can set the world right, but He cannot do it without men to help Him. Every deed of love and kindness, every piece of self-sacrifice, every act of forgiveness helps to turn it in the right direction.

The world can come right side up only when the men and women in it are right side up. So first we must get right ourselves by letting the love of Jesus into our hearts to drive out all that is bad, and then we can help to put the world right by loving and serving others.

### THE SAPPHIRE.

'A sapphire stone.'—Ezk 1<sup>26</sup>.

Our September gem is the sapphire.

You will remember that two months ago we said the sapphire was a cousin of the ruby. So it is—for both are corundum—only the ruby is red and the sapphire blue.

'Sapphire' is one of the oldest words in the world. It is found in most of the ancient languages, but clever men who have studied such things tell us that the name 'sapphire' was not always given to the same stone. The sapphire of the ancients, they say, was more probably a stone

which we now call the *lapis lazuli*, a blue stone with little gold flecks in it, which looks very like the sky on a starry night. These same clever men tell us that the stone we now call the sapphire was, in the days when the Book of Revelation was written, known as the jacinth or hyacinth. Well, we are not going to worry about that. We know that the sapphire *is* mentioned in the Bible, and whether it is called the sapphire or the jacinth does not matter very much for our purpose.

The sapphire is, next to the diamond, the hardest stone known. In proof of this there is an old tale that a certain man once went to Rome to sell a sapphire. The purchaser said he would buy it on one condition—that he might first test it. He placed it on an anvil and struck it a mighty blow with a hammer. The hammer flew in pieces and the anvil split, but the stone remained whole. We may have to take that story with a large grain of salt, but it shows what a hard stone the sapphire was supposed to be.

Ceylon has for ages been noted for its sapphires. They are found there as crystals, in water-borne deposits of sand and gravel. But Ceylon is not their only home. They come also from Siam, Upper Burma, Kashmir, Madagascar, Australia, Tasmania, and the United States. When they come from so many places you can understand that they are not so rare as rubies; still, a sapphire is one of the most valuable and lovely of gems.

The shade for a sapphire is cornflower blue, but there are sapphires of every other shade of blue you can mention, beginning at dark indigo and ending with palest sky. There is even a white or colourless variety which is so like a diamond that it takes an expert to tell the difference. There is also a wonderful kind known as the star-sapphire. In its blue depths there shines a star. With the slightest movement of the gem the star seems to move and twinkle also. This star-sapphire has been called 'the gem for Christmas' because its shining star reminds us of the star which shone in the sky two thousand years ago, and led the wise men to Bethlehem.

The sapphire has always been such a favourite that virtues of all kinds have been attributed to it. In olden days it was supposed to check fevers, calm the temper, mend manners, heal quarrels, and drive away melancholy. Funny, isn't it? that a blue stone should be supposed to frighten away 'the blues'! It was also said to bring happiness,

and good fortune to its possessor. Last but not least it was the emblem of truth, of constancy, and of heavenly-mindedness. No wonder, then, that it has always been a favourite with the Church, and that in the Cardinal's ring of office is set a sapphire gem.

Now, the diamond has already told us to be happy, the amethyst has told us to be true and loyal, so we are left with the last meaning of the sapphire as our message for to-day—'Be heavenly-minded.' The ruby said 'Love'; the sapphire says '*Love what is good.* Love the best. Seek what is beautiful and true. Have noble aims and high ideals.' That sounds a little difficult; perhaps this story will help to explain it.

A friend was visiting the studio of the great American artist, William Merritt Chase. He admired one by one all the many beautiful paintings in the room. Then he turned to the artist and said, 'Which of all these paintings do you consider your best?' The artist walked over to a large empty canvas, stretched in a frame, and said, 'That is my best work. I am sorry I cannot show you that picture. I am always trying to paint it, but

it still creeps ahead of me. I have painted it there in my mind a thousand times, and some day perhaps I shall be able to paint it as I see it.'

I want you to be like that famous artist. I want you to have beautiful thoughts that you want to make real, and noble dreams that you try to make true. For, boys and girls, you are the children of to-day, but you are the men and women of to-morrow. You have to make the world of to-morrow, and what your thoughts and dreams are, that—and exactly that—the world is going to be. For you are not to stop at mere thoughts and dreams. You are to turn these thoughts and dreams into deeds. I tell you solemnly that you can, if you will, make this world very nearly heaven upon earth. Yes, you can. High and pure and noble thoughts mean pure and noble deeds, and each pure and noble deed is just a little bit of heaven on earth.

See, then, that your sapphire is a star-sapphire. The star of Bethlehem led the three wise men to Heaven itself come down to earth. Let your Star Sapphire lead you too on and up to Christ.

## Calvin as a Preacher.

BY THE REV. A. MITCHELL HUNTER, M.A., CARDROSS.

NOWHERE does the whole personality of Calvin stand out in such clear relief as in his sermons. He was a born preacher. For years the spacious church of St. Pierre in Geneva was thronged, not once or twice, but several times a week to hear him. He was the star of the Genevan pulpit, but his words carried far beyond the city in which they were spoken. Seldom has any man addressed a wider audience or received a more grateful response. His sermons became models and standards for hundreds of pastors confined to such help as their publication supplied. Admiral Coligny, warrior, diplomatist, and saint, was not the only one who made them his daily provender; it is a testimony to their worth and substance that he read the 150 homilies on Job several times, beginning again as soon as he had finished. It was on Calvin's sermons on Ephesians that John Knox stayed his soul as he lay on his death-bed.

There is something of a perennially modern note in Calvin's preaching. He was not afraid to risk the charge of vulgarizing his theme by the use of the picturesque language of colloquial social intercourse. Whatever enabled him to grip the people's attention and penetrate to their consciences and hearts was legitimate. Much of his preaching was familiar talk poured forth by a man whose humanism could accord with a love for popular speech. If vernacular and classical alternatives presented themselves, the vernacular commonly received the preference. Proverbs tripped from his tongue as though coined on the spot for the occasion, and gave agreeable piquancy to his words. Illustrations and metaphors he drew from all sources, sometimes surprising by their unexpectedness, coming from the lips of such a man. An early translation, reproducing the flavour of the original, represents him as saying, 'We would fain live in



pleasure that God should dandle us like little cockneys!' Often he indulges in quite dramatic passages, making the characters with whom he is dealing express themselves in racy soliloquy or dialogue. Instead of making Moses, on receiving the order to ascend the mountain, point out how fatiguing and dangerous that would be for one of his years, Calvin pictures him as exclaiming, 'That's all very fine! And I'm to go and break my legs climbing up there, am I! Of all things in the world! That's a fine prospect!'

Calvin was a pattern extempore preacher. He objected to read sermons. It was his custom to immerse himself in his projected theme, with swift precision mapping out the course of his exposition, marshalling the thoughts which he would set forth in memorable order. For reproductions of his sermons we are indebted to reporters, whose shorthand was equal to taking them down almost word for word, even to the reporting of such observations as, 'As the clock is sounding, I cannot continue.' The verbal accuracy of such reports was in some degree made possible by the manner of Calvin's delivery. Scaliger, who often heard him, tells us that the weakness of his chest and his shortness of breath compelled him to speak deliberately and with pauses. Such pauses he often made deliberately long in order to give his hearers time to consider and digest what he had said. Calvin was not ambitious to gain a reputation for pulpit brilliance. His one aim and thought was to convict and convert, instruct, comfort, and guide. So little did he esteem his own discourses or realize their worth that it was only under strong pressure that he consented to their publication.

It is calculated that Calvin must have preached between 3000 and 4000 sermons; actually over 2000 have been preserved. He had no 'old store long kept' to which he had recourse when hard pressed. Always his discourses came fresh from the mint of his mind and heart. The brain that could in such a comparatively short ministry forge so many, in which it would be hard to find one trashy or thin, and of which so many could stand the test of publication, must have been an organ of enormous power and resource. Nor were they the dainty, piquant sermonettes with which the modern hearer is amply satisfied and too frequently regaled. Calvin, indeed, abhorred and denounced long sermons and prayers. He himself is credited

with having limited his discourses to half an hour's length; if so, he succeeded in giving generous measure. In view of his deliberateness, a glance at one of his sermons makes it evident that he could seldom have been within the hour in their delivery, though it may well be that the emptying of the hour-glass surprised both his hearers and himself.

He may be said to have been a faithfully textual preacher in that he aimed at letting his text speak instead of his speaking in place of the text. Fidelity to the meaning of the original was his first principle. To pervert or misinterpret the Word of God was to endanger the souls of those who took the preacher as their authority and guide.

While making it his chief business to expound the meaning of Scripture for the edification of piety, Calvin brought the social reformer and legislator into the pulpit with him. Budé, one of his secretaries, admiringly remarks that 'he adapted the teaching of the prophets to our time so fitly that it does not seem to suit better the time for which it was preached or written.' Nothing of current interest was regarded as alien to the pulpit. Those who would exclude from its review or purview anything that touches on politics would find no sympathy in Calvin or support from his practice. Whatever affected the social well-being, that was to him the concern of the faithful preacher. The pulpit of St. Pierre's was as much a political rostrum as a religious platform. He would admit no boundaries beyond which religion had no right to trespass or call to penetrate. The vindication of the claim of Christian morality to authoritative control in all spheres is one note of his preaching which is seldom absent. The passion for righteousness, industrial, social, commercial, political, glows and often burns fiercely through his sermons. He took in the whole earth in his sweep, making his pulpit a kind of news exchange. Did a heresy show its head anywhere in Protestantism or approach his own people, he advertised it to his hearers and put them on their guard. He reported upon the doings of the moment in France, England, Italy, wherever the struggle between truth and error raged. Preaching would not have seemed worth while to Calvin if he had been debarred from taking cognizance of such matters. He reckoned that the rôle of public censor and mentor belonged to the functions of the pulpit by reason of its divine commission. It was the

searching eye and the admonitory voice of God if the State was His retributive hand.

But while Calvin's sermons resound with the prophetic note, they are never without the gospel ring. The severity and the gentleness of God mingle in them as they do in the Scripture he expounded. If disciples and followers of his wielded vigorously the 'hangman's whip,' they did not take it out of his hands. He did not repudiate the method of inspiring the fear that might set men fleeing from the wrath to come, but he took the guiding principle of his preaching from the example of God who, if He often begins by threatening in order to awaken, yet ends by wooing in order to win. With all his sternness Calvin was a comforting preacher. No man had more needed divine comfort and assurance to sustain and fortify his soul than himself, and if ever man 'preached his own heart' it was Calvin. If he displays a comprehensive and intimate acquaintance with the human soul in all its waywardness and strangeness, its contradictions and weaknesses, its heights and its depths, it was given him through the knowledge of his own. Calvin came to the pulpit from the closet of prayerful self-examination. It was the convictions from which he drew his own consolation and hope and strength that he sought to bring home to others, like him in their constant need of them. Where Calvinistic preaching has had most power, it has been because it administered to sinful, tried, and stricken hearts the remedies which he of Geneva discovered to be potent for the healing of his own.

Yet Calvin was no emotional preacher; he never sought to work on his hearers' feelings with the flamboyant rhetoric that imparts a quiver to the voice. Not to touch them to tears or fears, but to give them something to carry away which would fit them the better to fight the good fight of faith, was his constant aim. What is commonly now assigned to the Bible class was provided by his pulpit. Historical, geographical, ethnographical

details and allusions in Scripture were explained with a clearness and fulness that evidenced the study without which Calvin never presumed to appear in the pulpit. Of that artful eloquence so wonderfully practised by the French pulpit orators of a later day there is no trace in him, nor is there any effort after embroidery or elegance of speech or flawless logical order. Whatever Calvin was at times in conference chambers or council rooms, in the pulpit he was always the self-possessed, collected teacher, not unimpassioned but never tearing his passion to shreds and tatters, always in full command of his thoughts, self-controlled even when most roused and heated. Beza tells us that he despised ostentatious, pretentious eloquence. He held it wrong to seek to give brilliance and charm to God's word by embellishment of language and subtleties of exposition. You must not try to improve upon the work of the Holy Spirit; that would be 'to paint the lily or adorn the rose.' Not that he was insensible to the qualities of true oratory or insusceptible to its influence. He studied Demosthenes and held him in the highest esteem, putting him first amongst those 'who attract and delight and move to the ravishment of the spirit.' In the Latinity of Cicero he took the keen delight of an æsthete in words. But he formed his own style on no exemplar; he was the imitator of none. In his case the style was the man, and the man shaped the style. All was nervous, spirited, earnest, eager, mostly level to the intelligence of the humblest who came to hear him, with that throb of suppressed passion often beating through it which touches the fringes of one's consciousness as the sound of a distant war-drum. His pulpit success is to be explained by no practised artfulness of words falling upon fascinated ears as Ezekiel's did upon the ears of the exiles who listened and then appraised his appeals as one does a lovely song; it is a tribute to the eloquence of simple sincerity and the power of a prophetic earnestness which feared no man because it so greatly feared God.



## Entre Nous.

To recapture the Weekday Service—that is the deepest desire. When it fell away men knew that a time of non-churchgoing was at hand. When it is recovered that distressing experience will come to an end.

But how is the Weekday Service to be recaptured? By co-operation. 'It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us.' So it is in all God's work, and so rigidly that the Holy Ghost does not work unless we work with Him.

We have to make the Weekday Service interesting. There are those who refuse to make any service interesting. They dislike the methods which they have seen resorted to, and condemn the end because the means were bad. But if we are not interesting we will not be listened to. And if we are not listened to? To be interesting every time is to win.

We must have tools. The Russians could not win because they had no weapons. Our weapons are our books. The speaker cannot speak without books any more than the Russians could fight without munitions.

A book has been published for the purpose of being used to recapture the Prayer Meeting and the Senior Bible Class. Its title is *Faith*. It is the second volume of a series issued by Messrs. T. & T. Clark on the 'Great Christian Doctrines.' It is divided into eighteen chapters, a fair season's work, to be shortened or lengthened at will.

### SOME TOPICS.

#### The Old Men.

Mr. Cecil Roberts has an Introduction to his volume of poems. It is a quotation from 'The late Lieut. Archibald Don.' This is the quotation: 'To many of us, I am sure—for I can judge of the others by myself—the greatest trial that this war has brought is that it has released the old men from all restraining influences and has let them loose upon the world. The city editors, the retired majors, the amazons, and last, but I fear not least, the Venerable Archdeacons, have never been so free from contradiction. Just when the younger generation was beginning to take its share in the affairs of the world, and was hoping to counteract the Victorian influences of the older generation,

this war has come to silence us—permanently or temporarily, as the case may be.

'Meanwhile the old men are having field-days "on their own." In our name (and for *our* sakes as they pathetically imagine) they are doing their very utmost, it would seem, to perpetuate by their appeals to hate, intolerance, and revenge, those very follies which have produced the present conflagration. . . .

'Were we but in sympathy with the older generation we should care not a pin for Belgian mud or German bullets. As it is, the older men are apt to fill some of us with indescribable depression, for they will blindly sacrifice, perhaps, not only us, who matter little, but our ideals too, which matter a great deal.'

#### Gambling.

Professor George Herbert Palmer in his book on Altruism, noticed among the literature, has something to say about gambling. 'Living long among college students and observing their natural pleasure in all sorts of moral experimentation, I have come to believe gambling the vice most likely to wreck character. All forms of vice are bad enough. It is shocking to see a young man drunk. But drunkenness grows steadily rarer, and, after all, a drinker remains pretty much himself when the fit is off. I have had friends of this sort who when not in liquor showed the same interest in worthy things as other men. But when I see the gambling habit getting hold of a young man I despair of him. For several reasons it is unlikely he will be good for much thereafter. Seldom does a vice or virtue have only a single root. On the one hand the gambler gives up rational modes of guidance, ceases to calculate clearly, lives on the unexpected, and looks for some deliverance to drop from the sky. A hectic anxiety takes possession of him and disorganizes his life. But there are results worse still. Gambling, in contrast with honest trade, admits only a single gain. I can gain nothing for myself except by damaging another. I must directly seek his harm. The tradesman benefits himself through benefiting his customer. His business is grounded on the double gain. He draws profit, it is true, from another man's pocket, but he does not, like the gambler,

stop there. He puts back into that pocket a little more than the equivalent of what he took out. The gambler breaks up this mutuality and lives as a bandit by attack. Thus dehumanized and shut up to his separate self he rots. When trade allows the double gain to drop out of sight, it too becomes gambling and shows the same predatory tendencies. Honest trade is a different matter. Its mutual profit carries altruism through a community more wholesomely than can any arbitrary will.'

#### The Oriental Christ.

Mr. Arthur Bertram, whose book *In Darkest Christendom* is noticed among the books of the month, has no love for the modern patron whether of a 'living' or of Christ. He says, 'the class of writers, whether spiritualistic or "philosophical," who meet with the readiest acceptance to-day, although they usually patronize Christ, are fond of referring with lofty superiority to His message as an "Oriental religion," or to belief in that message as a "mediæval faith." These men really believe they know more than Christ! Oh, the madness of human conceit! Who ever found Christ wrong? Where else can we turn and find such essential truth—such insight and judgment? Perhaps we ought to use loftier words when speaking of Him, but these suit our purpose best for the moment. Dealing as He does with matters of the heart and conscience, He speaks directly, and—we are disposed to think—particularly, to this age. He is speaking, in fact, to *us*. As I read His words I am impressed with the fact that He knows the people *I* know; He knows our modern society through and through; He knows our politics, He knows our "religion," and He knows our press. And He knows *me*, as I am often constrained painfully to confess. In the sphere of the matters with which He deals, local and temporal conditions have no place. His message is not "Oriental," though it was first spoken under Eastern skies; it is universal. He speaks to the human heart, which remains the same—east, west, north, and south—from the days in which He spoke on earth to the end of the age. And never man spake like this man. Under His eye, all distinctions of wealth, learning or social position fall away like the rags they are. At His first word, He gets right down to the man underneath all his self-assumed distinctions, and deals with *him*; what he *is*, what

he *does*, and what are his motives. Not what is his position, his politics, his philosophy, or even his "religion."

#### NEW POETRY.

##### Charles Hamilton Sorley.

A new edition has been issued of *Marlborough and Other Poems*, by Charles Hamilton Sorley (Cambridge: at the University Press; 5s. net). It is the Fourth Edition, and it is intended to be definitive. The poems are now arranged in four groups according to subject, while within each group they are printed as nearly as may be in the order of their composition. The prose pieces added to the third edition are retained, and a few notes have been appended to them. There is a beautiful photogravure frontispiece from a drawing in chalks by Mr. Cecil Jameson. For illustration we choose the last of the poems. It is written in memory of another; it is his own *In Memoriam*:

There is no fitter end than this.

No need is now to yearn nor sigh.

We know the glory that is his,

A glory that can never die.

Surely we knew it long before,

Knew all along that he was made

For a swift radiant morning, for

A sacrificing swift night-shade.

##### Dora Sigerson.

This is the last book of poetry we shall have from Mrs. Clement Shorter. *The Sad Years* it is called (Constable; 5s. net). For all the poems in it were written after the beginning of the war. They were arranged for publication by the author shortly before her death, which took place on the 6th of January 1918. Katharine Tynan writes an introduction to the book. Speaking of Dora Sigerson's death she says: 'She attributed it herself to her intense and isolated suffering—isolated beyond the perfect sympathy of her devoted husband—over the events following Easter week, 1916, in Dublin, and the troubles which menaced the country she adored. I think she need not have felt so bitterly isolated; the spirit of humanity is strong in the good English—and the good English are very good—but the fact remains that she broke her heart over it all; and so she died,



as she would have chosen to die, for love of the Dark Rosaleen.'

'I will not speak,' says Katharine Tynan, 'of her beautiful poetry, essential poetry, always with a passionate emotion to give it wings. It is for the critic. No one will say she was not happy in her English life, though her heart was always slipping away like a grey bird to Ireland. She had a very full life and she had absolute devotion and knew what a precious thing she had.'

For estimating the poetry itself we are still too early or already too late. But we can enjoy it. This for example :

#### ON THE OTHER SIDE.

What will you do through the waiting days,  
What will my darling do?  
Will you sleep, or wander in those strange ways  
Until I can come to you?

Do you cry at the door as I cry here,  
Death's door that lies between?  
Do you plead in vain for my love, my dear,  
As you stand by my side unseen?

Who will comfort your difficult ways  
That were hard to understand,  
When I who knew you through all your days,  
Can give you no helping hand?

When I who loved you no word can speak,  
Though your ghost should cry to me,  
Can give no help, though my heart should break  
At the thought of your agony.

You were shy of strangers—and who will come  
As you stand there lone and new,  
Through the long years when my lips are dumb  
What will my darling do?

John McCrae.

Some of the best poetry of the war has been published in *Punch*. One of the best poems that have been published in *Punch* had the title 'In Flanders Fields. That poem was written by Lieut.-Col. John McCrae, M.D. Here is the story of the writing of it. It was told in a letter from Major-General E. W. B. Morrison, C.B., who commanded Dr. McCrae's brigade at the time. 'This poem,' General Morrison writes, 'was literally born of fire and blood during the hottest phase of the second battle of Ypres. My headquarters were in a trench on the top of the bank of the Ypres Canal, and John had his dressing

station in a hole dug in the foot of the bank. During periods in the battle men who were shot actually rolled down the bank into his dressing station. Along from us a few hundred yards was the headquarters of a regiment, and many times during the sixteen days of battle he and I watched them burying their dead whenever there was a lull. Thus the crosses, row on row, grew into a good-sized cemetery. Just as he describes, we often heard in the mornings the larks singing high in the air, between the crash of the shell and the reports of the guns in the battery just beside us. I have a letter from him in which he mentions having written the poem to pass away the time between the arrival of batches of wounded, and partly as an experiment with several varieties of poetic metre. I have a sketch of the scene, taken at the time, including his dressing station; and during our operations at Passchendaele last November, I found time to make a sketch of the scene of the crosses, row on row, from which he derived his inspiration.'

And now for the poem :

In Flanders fields the poppies blow  
Between the crosses, row on row,  
That mark our place; and in the sky  
The larks, still bravely singing fly  
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

We are the Dead. Short days ago  
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,  
Loved and were loved, and now we lie  
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:  
To you from failing hands we throw  
The torch; be yours to hold it high.  
If ye break faith with us who die  
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow  
In Flanders fields.

That poem will now be found as the first of a volume of poems written by Dr. McCrae in a volume entitled *In Flanders Fields* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The volume contains not only Dr. McCrae's poems, but also a short biography by Sir Andrew Macphail. The biography tells us that Dr. McCrae was a Canadian and a man of some distinction in his profession. Along with Dr. Adami he was the author of a text-book of pathology. He volunteered first for the Boer War and then for the Great War. He died in hospital, of pneumonia, on the 28th of January 1918.

## Charles G. D. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts's *New Poems* (Constable; 2s. 6d. net) make a small book, but the book is all poetical. And in poetry, if in anything, it is quality that counts. We are not yet far enough away from the war to miss war poems, nor are we likely to be for many days to come. But the note of this book is the love of nature more than the horror of war. Take this on

## THE GOOD EARTH.

The smell of burning weeds  
Upon the twilight air;  
The piping of the frogs  
From meadows wet and bare;

A presence in the wood,  
And in my blood a stir;  
In all the ardent earth  
No failure or demur.

O spring wind, sweet with love  
And tender with desire,  
Pour into veins of mine  
Your pure, impassioned fire.

O waters running free  
With full, exultant song,  
Give me, for outworn dream,  
Life that is clean and strong.

O good Earth, warm with youth,  
My childhood heart renew.  
Make me elate, sincere,  
Simple and glad, as you.

O springing things of green,  
O waiting things of bloom,  
O winging things of air,  
Your lordship now resume.

## George Willis.

The Y.M.C.A. has been criticised and it will be criticised again. Here is an unsolicited testimonial. It is somewhat long for our space but we shall make room, for the good cause. It is found in a volume of racy verse by Mr. George Willis, entitled *Any Soldier to his Son* (Allen & Unwin; 1s. 3d. net).

## YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

I'm not exactly young, Sir, and I shouldn't like to say  
That the Army of Good Christians would ever  
pass me 'A';  
But I wasn't disconcerted by the words above  
your door,  
For I found a name that fitted in the second  
of the four.

I was still a man, I reckoned, though a soldier  
of the Line,  
I'd a human soul inside me, though I couldn't  
call it mine.  
And, sometimes, even a soldier likes a word  
from civil lips  
To salt his plate of porridge or to sauce his fish  
and chips.  
The Army found us fodder, but the only place  
I knew  
Where a man could get a meal was in the tavern  
kept by you.  
I own I sometimes wriggled when you hooked  
me on your line,  
When I sought your bar at supper-time and  
found it 'Closed till 9,'  
When I found you serving hymn-books or  
extemporizing prayer,  
But I took the hook and chewed it, I was  
caught, I own it, fair;  
And your service was a respite from the same  
old changes rung  
On the same war-weary curse-words and the  
same old Army dung.  
And though it wasn't filling, like your porridge  
and your buns,  
Your music served to drown awhile the booming  
of the guns.  
You were always fit and smiling at the old  
pot-wallah job;  
You never lost your temper with the seething,  
jostling mob.  
Though you didn't lose your temper, you'd  
have lost a quid or two  
If the grub we didn't pay for had been counted  
off your screw.  
You didn't have to rough it in the trenches,  
but we know  
It wasn't all too cushy on a night of blinding  
snow,  
When half the tents were rocking and the other  
half were flat,  
To wonder if your own would stand another  
gust like that.  
Though you weren't the same as we were, though  
you wore a braided suit,  
We didn't have to pass you at 'Attention' or  
Salute.  
But now I touch my cap to you, with many  
thousands more,  
As the one good friend and fellow of the boys  
who fought this war.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,  
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,  
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary com-  
munications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings  
Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.





GTU Library



3 2400 00276 7709

**Date Due**

APR



Expository times

vol 30, 1918/19

MAR 25 1939

FEB 5 '60

NOV 26 '71

JUN 1 '73

CBPac



